Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BS2320 .C5
Charteris, A. H. (Archibald HamilMAIN
Canonicity : a collection of early testi
3 9967 00125 2381

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SCRIPTURA SACRA
SOLA FIDE
ILLINOIS
Ex Libris

295.23

East Adams 24 Chic. & N. W. R.

6 50 net

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

S. H. Gravert.

CANONICITY

CANONICITY

A COLLECTION OF EARLY TESTIMONIES TO THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BASED ON

KIRCHHOFER'S 'QUELLENSAMMLUNG'

BY

A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH; AND ONE
OF HER MAJESTY'S CHAPLAINS

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCLXXX

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS

All Rights reserved

BS
2320
.C5

CHRIST'S CHURCH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
ORANGE, CALIFORNIA

TO

WILLIAM PURDIE DICKSON, D.D.

TO WHOSE FRIENDSHIP I HAVE OWED MUCH IN MY STUDIES
FOR MANY YEARS,

AND TO

JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D.

WHO NEVER SPARES HIS OWN TIME WHEN HE CAN HELP A FRIEND,
AND WHO HAS MADE ME FREE OF HIS VALUABLE LIBRARY
WHILE I WORKED AT THIS BOOK,

I DESIRE TO INSCRIBE IT,

WISHING IT WERE MORE WORTHY.

PREFACE.

This work is based on Kirchhofer's 'Quellensammlung,' which has been out of print for some years. When I began to prepare it, I hoped that Kirchhofer's text might be such a basis that my part would mainly be to revise his extracts, with such merely occasional supplement as recent researches and discoveries might render necessary. But it was soon evident that a reissue must contain much more than this; and from less to more, the work has grown in my hands until it is substantially independent of the 'Quellensammlung,' although the text is still an attempt to collect and classify, rather than to characterise, the passages on which controversy turns. The footnotes have relation to Kirchhofer's in only a few cases; the biographical notes and the Introduction are new. There is a great change in the extracts themselves. New discoveries of MSS, the shifting grounds of controversy, and the special researches of individual scholars, have made it indispensable for the student of theology to have extracts compiled with a view to the state of criticism in our own day.

In attempting to make this compilation, I have used

all the helps to which I had access. But it is a pleasant duty to say even in the title-page that Kirchhofer's book is after all the basis of this, and to record here my sense of the obligation under which all students of the subject during the last forty years have been laid by his impartial and trustworthy collection of ancient testimonies. Many of the other works that have been used are named in the notes. I may say that my admiration of Lardner (on whom Kirchhofer almost exclusively relied) has been increased with increasing knowledge of parts of the wide field over which his splendid labours extended. There is even now no book on the whole so indispensable as his. Canon Westcott's works, which have made the subject familiar in our country, are invaluable to every student. I have also owed much throughout to the works of Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Keim, Dr S. Davidson, and the author of 'Supernatural Religion.' Frequent reference is made to the well-known books and articles of Dr Donaldson, Bishop Lightfoot, and Dr Sanday; and to the works of Continental scholars, as Weizsäcker, Wittichen, Volkmar, Aubé, Overbeck, Waddington, Lipsius, Wieseler, Rénan, Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn.

The standard editions of the various authors have been used so far as possible; but as experience has taught me how important it is to verify references easily, I have in several of the more voluminous authors (as Origen, Athanasius, &c.) stated the page at which the passage will be found in Migne's edition, which is accessible to almost all students. For Eusebius's Church History, the text of Burton has been on the whole the standard in the very numerous extracts, though Laemmer and Heinichen have

been in use. Attention is drawn in the footnotes to the more important cases of doubtful readings in the extracts. In regard to most of the Epistles of the New Testament, a prefatory note in each case indicates the state of the controversy. In footnotes, also, will be found some biographical notices of those authors to whom special reference is not made in the Introduction. The Introduction itself seemed to be indispensable, unless the footnotes were to be extended beyond all reasonable limits. It was originally intended to have a chapter on the avowed grounds of the reception of the Canon in Christendom, especially since the Reformation (see note, p. 33), but I have found that it would be too long for this Introduction, unless it were too meagre to be of use. The series of extracts, pp. 18-31, will to a certain extent tell their own story. I ask permission to refer to an article on the subject of "Canonicity" in this aspect in the 'Brit. and For. Evang. Review,' No. 75 (Feb. 1871). I regret not having in the Introduction an examination of the testimony of Irenæus, but it may be learned from the extracts in the text.

In the course of my work on this book, which has to my great regret been interrupted by causes that I could not control, I have had much help from many friends. Among old students I may especially mention the Rev. Thomas Nicol, B.D., to whom I owe a great part of a first collation of the text of Kirchhofer with that of the standard editions, the chapter on the Clementine Homilies, as also the Analytical Index, and without whom this work would never have been undertaken; the Rev. James Coullie, B.D., who made the careful, and, I think, exhaustive Index; the Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, B.D.; the Rev. William Allardyce,

M.A.; and the Rev. J. H. Crawford, M.A., who have all kindly helped in collation and correction. From Mr R. J. Cownie, M.A., I have had much willing work of the same kind on the whole text after the first one hundred pages. To Drs Donaldson, Sanday, Dickson, and Turpie, and the Rev. Henry Cowan, B.D., I owe more than I can here record in detail. To Professor Weizsäcker, Tübingen, the Rev. W. Pressel, Lustnau, and Professor Christlieb, Bonn, for the encouragement which induced me to undertake the work, and for cheering counsel throughout, my best thanks are due, and I gladly tender them.

That there are occasional errors in the text and in the many references I fear is only too likely, though every effort has been used to avoid them. Those who have tried to do the same kind of work will be most ready to excuse slips and errors where they occur. I am aware that absolute uniformity in the mode of reference to particular authors has not been always maintained; but I trust the passages may be usually found. It is my ambition and my hope that the book may prove useful not only to students of theology in the class-room, but also to ministers and others desirous of investigating for themselves the problems to which so much attention is turned in our times.

A. H. C.

October 1880.

S. G. Jaquett.
From Dr.
LIBRARY
WEST'N THEO. SEM'Y,
WASHINGTON BOUL'D,
CHICAGO.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

1. BARNABAS, ... i
   Epistle ascribed to Barnabas held in high estimation, ii—author a Jew, but not the Apostle, iii—date of Epistle uncertain, iv—written to a Greek Church by a Greek, v—relation to John's Gospel, Clement, and the O. T., vi—parallel passages with Fourth Gospel, vii.
2. CLEMENT OF ROME, ... viii
   First Epistle.—Works ascribed to Clement, viii—MSS of Epistle, viii and ix—who Clement was, ix—evidence of his writing the Epistle; age of the Epistle, x—evidence as to Canon of N. T., xii—quotations of O. T., xiii—quotations of N. T., xiv—doctrinal teaching, xvi—relation to the truths of Christianity, xvii.
   Second Epistle.—A Homily, not by Clement, xviii—place and date, xix—testimony to Scripture, xx—conclusion as to, xxi—list of N. T. references, xxii—other Epistles ascribed to Clement, xxiii.
3. HERMAS, ... xxiv
   Characteristics of, xxiv—reception in the early Church; MSS of; state of text, xxv.
4. IGNATIUS, ... xxvi
   Number of Epistles, xxvi—editions, xxvii—objections to all the recensions, xxix—classified quotations in the Ignatian letters, xxx.
5. POLYCARP, ... xxxiv
   The Epistle and the author, xxxiv—date of Polycarp's death and of the Epistle, xxxv—quotations from N. T., xxxvi—classified quotations from the Epistle and from the Martyrdom of Polycarp, xxxviii.
6. PAPIAS, ... xli
   Papias and his treatise, xli—his date, xliii—his testimony to Matthew and Mark, xliv. *Note on the tradition of John in Ephesus.*
7. BASILIDES, ... xlvii
   Date and system of Basilides, xlvii—his relation to the Gospels, xlix—does Hippolytus quote Basilides himself? l—author of 'Supernatural Religion' on Basilides, li. *Note on the system of Basilides.*

8. JUSTIN MARTYR, ... liii
Justin a link between Apostolic age and Irenæus, liii—his extant writings, lv—substantial agreement with N. T.; characteristics of his mode of quotation, lvii—agreement with Apocryphal writers, lix—conclusions, lx—use of John's Gospel; use of Paul's Epistles, lxii.

9. CLEMENTINE HOMILIES, ... lxiii
Homilies and Recognitions, lxiii—use of Matthew, lxiv—of Luke and Mark, lxvi—of John; of Apocryphal Gospels, lxvii—of Acts and Pauline Epistles, lxviii.

10. GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS, ... lxviii
The problem, lxviii—Nazarenes and Ebionites, lxix—their Gospels, lxx—Jerome's conflicting statements, lxxi—possible reconciliation of them, lxxii—the more important Clementine quotations, lxxiii—*the Ebionite Gospel*, lxxiv—conclusion as to Gospel of the Hebrews, lxxv—*Gospel of the Egyptians*, lxxvi.

11. HEGESIPPUS, ... lxxvii
Eusebius on Hegesippus, lxxvii—a champion of Christianity, lxxviii—his allusions to the canonical books, lxxix.

12. MURATORIAN CANON, ... lxxix
Where found, lxxix—value of the fragment, lxxx—summary of, lxxxi.

13. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, ... lxxxi
Date of Clement, lxxxi—works, quotations, views of Gnosis, lxxxii.

14. ORIGEN, ... lxxxv
Date of Origen, writings, and testimony, lxxxv.

15. THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY, ... lxxxv
What it was, lxxxv—Tübingen use of it, lxxxvi—(1) *the authorities from whom we learn its nature and progress*, lxxxvii—(2) *the controversy and the combatants at successive stages*, lxxxviii—first period, lxxxix—second period, xci—third period (according to Eusebius), xcii—the statements in 'The Paschal Chronicle,' xciii—conclusion, xcv.

16. APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE, ... xcvi
The claim and the dates of N. T. Apocrypha, xcvi—extra-canonical books not all heretical, xcvii—various meanings of "Gospel" in N. T. Apocrypha, xcviii—division of Apocrypha into *Gospels, Acts, Epistles, Apocalypses*, xcix—*Apocryphal Gospels:* Protevangel, c—Gospel of Thomas; of Nicodemus, ci—Gospels in names of Apostles; Gospels named after those who used them, cii—Harmonies, miscellaneous; all imply the canonical books, ciii—discrepancies in different editions of Apocryphal Gospels proofs of their want of authority, civ—how the names perished from memory; *Apocryphal Acts*, cv—purpose of the Acts, cvi—collections by Leucius and by Abdias; *Apocryphal Epistles; Apocryphal Apocalypses*, cvii.

17. THE FOURTH GOSPEL, ... cviii
Comments on the catena of testimony in the text, cviii—modern views of the Fourth Gospel, cx—internal evidence that the Gospel was written by an eyewitness, cxi—by a Jew of Palestine, cxii—by an enlightened disciple; a man of calm authority; one with a definite purpose, cxiii—objections stated and considered, cxiv-cxvi.

ANALYTICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX, ... cxvii

I.—OLDEST TESTIMONIES TO A COLLECTION OF SACRED BOOKS.

1. The Peshito Syriac. Second century, ... 1
Wants Apocalypse, Jude, 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John.
2. The Old Latin. Second century, ... 2
Wants Hebrews, 2 Peter, and (perhaps) James.
3. Muratorian Canon. Second century, A.D. 160-170, ... 3
Text according to Tregelles; text as probably to be read; testimony to Gospels, thirteen Epistles of Paul, Acts (as Luke's), at least two Epistles of John, Jude, and Apocalypse; Apocalypse of Peter.
4. Canon of Origen (from Eus. H. E. VI. 25), A.D. 184-253, . . 8
Four Gospels, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse, 1 John, 1 Peter, and (as not accepted by all) 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter; Epistle to Hebrews characterised, and its authorship discussed (James and Jude elsewhere included by Origen).
5. Canon of Eusebius (H. E. III. 25, about A.D. 260-340), . . 10
Accepted—Four Gospels; Acts, Epp. of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, and (perhaps) the Apocalypse.
Disputed—James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.
Spurious—Apocalypse (perhaps).
6. Codex Vaticanus. Fourth century, ... 12
Contains N. T. canon so far, but the MS is imperfect.
7. Codex Sinaiticus. Fourth century, ... 12
Canonical books of N. T., with Acts in a peculiar position; also Barnabas and Hermas.
8. Canon of Athanasius. Middle of fourth century, ... 13
Exactly the same as our canon.
9. Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, ... 15
List of O. T. and N. T. books; the Apocrypha mentioned; narratives of the composition of the Four Gospels.

II.—TESTIMONIES TO THE CANON (OF LATER DATE).

1. Canon of the Laodicene Council, A.D. 364, ... 18
Apocalypse omitted.
2. Canon of Cyril of Jerusalem. Middle of fourth century, . . 19
Apocalypse omitted.
3. Canon of Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, ... 20
Books of N. T. first enumerated.
4. Canon of Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia (born A.D. 367, died A.D. 403), 21
Includes Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach.
5. Canon of Jerome (born A.D. 329, died A.D. 420), ... 21
Epistle to Hebrews, in the opinion of the majority, not St Paul's.
6. Augustine (born A.D. 354, died A.D. 430), ... 22
Accepts received canon of N. T., but doubts authenticity of Hebrews.
7. Chrysostom (born A.D. 347, died A.D. 407), ... 23
Omits Apocalypse, and mentions three Catholic Epp.

8. Codex Alexandrinus. End of fourth century, ... 23
Contains our canon with Clement's Epp., and, though in a different grade, the Psalms of Solomon.
9. Gelasius, A.D. 492, ... 23
His own decree contains the Canonical N. T.; a recension (Damasus) contains details ascribing two Epp. of John to Presbyter John; another recension (Hormisdas) gives a list of heretical and schismatical books.
10. Apostolical Constitutions. Fourth century, ... 25
Canonical books enumerated, and Apocryphal books mentioned.
11. Canones Ecclesiastici qui dicuntur Apostolorum. Fourth century, . 26
Books of Scripture enumerated, including in the N. T. some Apocrypha, the two Epp. of Clement, and the διαταγαί sent through Clement. The Apocalypse is not included in the N. T.
12. Codex Claromontanus. Probably sixth century, ... 27
Containing the N. T. as in the Canon; but also a list which wants Thessalonians, Hebrews, and Philippians; and adds Pastor, Actus Pauli, Rev. Petri.
13. Anastasius Sinaita, died A.D. 599, ... 28
Divides the books into three classes—(1) Biblical; (2) extra-Biblical; (3) Apocryphal.
14. Trullan Council, A.D. 692, ... 29
Approves of Athanasius and of Apostolical Canons (which contradict each other).
15. Nicephorus, died A.D. 828, ... 29
Apocalypse ranked among Antilegomena; Apocryphal books mentioned.
16. Canon of Council of Trent, A.D. 1546, ... 30
Enumerates books of Scripture, with Apocrypha of O. T.; text of Scripture fixed according to the Vulgate; Scripture and tradition the rule of faith.
17. Old Catholic Union Theses, 1874, ... 32
Scripture the primary rule; tradition also authoritative.
18. Cyril Lukar's Confession. Suggested to the Greek Church, A.D. 1629-38, 33
Canon of N. T. as in Protestant Churches; supremacy of Scripture.
19. Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672, ... 34
Commonly accepted in the Greek Church till 1839; Scripture and the Church equal.
20. Philaret's Longer Catechism, A.D. 1839, ... 35
Number of books stated; Divine revelation in two channels—holy tradition and Holy Scripture—the latter needful to keep the Divine revelation unchangeable.

LUTHERAN TESTIMONY.

21. Formula of Concord, A.D. 1577, ... 36
Art. i. 1, 2, 7, 8; Scripture the sole rule of faith.

REFORMED CONFESSIONS.

22. Confession of Basle, A.D. 1536, ... 37
Canonical Scripture the only rule of life.
23. Confessio Helvetica Posterior, A.D. 1566, ... 38
Scripture the Word of God, and self-authenticating.
24. Confessio Fidei Gallicana, A.D. 1559, ... 38
Canonical Scripture the rule of faith, and evidenced by the inner witness of the Spirit.
25. Old Scottish Confession, A.D. 1560, ... 39
Scripture does not owe its authority to men.
26. Confessio Bohœmica, A.D. 1535, ... 39
Scripture received by the Fathers true and most certain.
27. Anglican Articles of Religion, A.D. 1562, ... 40
All books canonical which were never doubted, and are commonly received; Apocrypha may be read for instruction.
28. Westminster Confession of Faith, 1643-47, ... 40
Scriptures given by inspiration; have authority from God; many arguments evidencing them to be the Word of God; but full persuasion of their infallible truth and divine authority due to the inward work of the Holy Spirit.

LIBRARY
WEST'N THEO. SEM'Y,
WASHINGTON BOUL'D,
CHICAGO.

III.—THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE.

1. Ignatius (date? see p. xxvi), ... 42
Quotations regarding "the Gospel" and "the Apostles."
2. Melito, A.D. 170 (Eus. H. E. IV. 26), ... 43
A new collection of books was known distinct from the O. T.
3. Dionysius of Corinth, A.D. 170 (Eus. H. E. IV. 23), ... 44
Speaks of *αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί*.
4. Irenæus (about A.D. 180-190, see note, p. 422), (I. 3. 6; I. 6. 3; II. 35. 4; III. 4. 1. 2, Ep. ad Florin.) 45
Speaks of "evangelical" and "apostolical" writings; calls the N. T. Scriptures, &c.
5. Tertullian, born A.D. 160; died between A.D. 220-40, ... 46
De præscript., 30, 32, 33—Seeds of Gnostic heresies condemned in N. T., 36—Appeal to churches to which Apostolic Epp. had been written, 37, 38; heretics have no right to appeal to Scripture; Marcion mutilated Scripture; Valentinus perverted it, though using a "complete instrument."
Adv. Marcionem, IV. 1, Marcion's Antithesis; *Apolog.*, c. 3, loyalty of Christians; *De Monog.*, c. 11, the "authentic Greek;" *Adv. Praxean*, c. 15, the Old and New Testaments.
6. Clement of Alexandria (head of catechetical school, A.D. 190-203), . 50
Passages speaking of *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὁ ἀπόστολος, αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί, ἡ Κυρίου φωνή*, &c.
7. Origen (Hom. on Gen. xiii. 2, on Josh. vii. 2), ... 51
Enumerates N. T. books.
8. Lactantius (Institut. IV. 20), died A.D. 325, ... 52
Division of Old and New Testaments.

IV.—THE GOSPELS.

1. Papias (Eus. H. E. III. 36), A.D. 70 to A.D. 150, . . . 53
From Eusebius—Papias and Polycarp.
From Eusebius and Jerome—John survived till the times of Trajan; Papias and Polycarp were his hearers.
Irenæus on Papias's millenarian views.
Eusebius on Papias and his mode of proceeding with his "Exegeses," the Logia.
Jerome on the same.
Later writers on Papias.

2. Justin Martyr, ... 59
General references to authorities and memoirs.
Passages in which he expressly cites his authorities. (Compare below, p. 125.)

3. Letter to Diognetus, c. 11, ... 65
Mentions εὐαγγέλια and ἀπόστολοι as used in Christian Church. See note.

4. The Evangelists of Trajan's time (Eus. H. E. III. 37), . . . 65
Speak of θεῖος λόγος, θεῖα εὐαγγέλια, &c.

5. Quadratus (Eus. H. E. IV. 3), ... 66
Survival to his time (Hadrian) of some on whom miracles had been wrought.

6. Irenæus, ... 66
III. 1. Sole authority of Scriptures; composition of the Four Gospels.
III. 11, 7. Gospels used by Ebionites, Marcion, Valentinus, &c.
III. 11, 8, 9. Four Gospels; the probable number; even heretics need Gospels; Montanists? Gospel of Truth.

7. The Presbyters, ... 71
Iren. IV. 32, 1. One God of Old Testament and of New; John's Gospel.
II. 22, 5. Our Lord lived to old age.
V. 36, 1, 2. Grades of spiritual existence and reward.

8. Tatian (Eus. H. E. IV. 29), A.D. 170, ... 72
His Diatessaron; Theodoret found more than 200 copies of Tatian's book.

9. Theophilus, A.D. 180-193, ... 73
Puts prophets and apostles on the same level as inspired; wrote commentaries on the four Gospels.

10. Clement of Alexandria (Eus. H. E. VI. 14), ... 74
Made expositions of all Scripture, including the Antilegomena; origin of Mark's Gospel; also Gospel of Egyptians.

11. Tertullian, ... 75
Against Marcion, IV. cc. 2, 3, 4, 5; Marcion's mode of proceeding; his Gospel later than the canonical St Luke; John the first bishop; Mark Peter's interpreter; Luke's Gospel ascribed to Paul.

12. Origen, ... 81
Contra Cels. III. 473, characteristics of the Gospels; *in Luc.* III. 932, the true Gospels, the lost, the heretical, and the Apocryphal Gospels; *in Joh.* I. 4, 6, the Gospel the "first-fruits;" *ibid.* V. 98, the four Gospels one.

13. Dionysius of Alexandria, Ep. *ad Basilid.* (A.D. 247-265), . . 86
On disputes as to the time of Christ's resurrection, says the four Gospels agree in essentials.
14. Eusebius (H. E. III. 24) (about A.D. 260 to about A.D. 340), . . 87
John's narrative begins earlier in the ministry than the synoptists; John's first Ep. undisputed; the others and the Apoc. under discussion; *Dem. Evang.* III. 5, Matthew's Gospel and John's agree; Mark's Gospel is "Peter's memoirs;" impossibility of forging such Gospels; the (supposititious?) testimony of Josephus.
15. Epiphanius (Hær. II. 1. 51), ... 95
Matthew wrote in Hebrew; Mark one of the seventy-two disciples; Luke wrote in some connection with Paul; John wrote after he was ninety-two years old against "Cerinthus, Ebion, and the rest."
16. Jerome, ... 99
Comment. in Mat. Procem., the four evangelists and the false and apocryphal Gospels; the four animal-symbols of the evangelists; *Præf. in IV. Evang.*, the order of the four evangelists.

V.—THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS AND THE SYNOPTISTS.

1. Barnabas (date? see p. iii), ... 102
Quotation of Mat. xxii. 14, with ὡς γέγραπται; Mat. ix. 13.
2. Clement of Rome (A.D. 93), ... 104
First Epistle.—C. 13, passage parallel with the Sermon on the Mount; c. 15, 1, quotation of O. T. through St Mark.
Second Epistle.—A. Citations agreeing with the synoptists.
B. Citations not agreeing with the synoptists.
3. Hermas (A.D. 142), ... 108
Passages reminding us of the Gospels; Mand. I. 1, quoted by Irenæus as ἡ γραφή.
4. Ignatius, ... 110
Passages resembling the synoptists in details; Smyrn. III. 1, from Luke xxiv. 36, John xx. 22, or apocryphal source?
5. Polycarp (date A.D. 154? see p. xxxiv), ... 112
Phil. c. 2, 3, parallel with Sermon on Mount (see also Clement, p. 105).
6. Martyrdom of Polycarp (A.D. 154?), ... 113

VI.—GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

(Compare also Sections IV. and V.)

1. Papias (Eus. H. E. III. 40), ... 114
Matthew wrote τὰ λόγια in Hebrew.
2. Justin Martyr, ... 114
A. Citations and references found in our Gospels.
B. Citations wholly or partially not in our Gospels.
3. Letter to Diognetus, ... 127
C. 9, Mat. vi. 25.

4. Hegesippus, ... 127
References to his work and doctrines in Eusebius and Photius.
5. Tatian, ... 129
Quotations of an Encratite character preserved by Clem. Alex.
6. Irenæus, ... 129
Matthew wrote for Hebrews, &c.
7. Athenagoras, ... 131
Quotations from the Sermon on the Mount to vindicate the character of Christians.
8. Theophilus, ... 132
Quotation from the Sermon on the Mount.
9. Pantænus, ... 133
Pantænus found among the Indians Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew, taken to them by Bartholomew.
10. Clement of Alexandria, ... 134
Matthew gives the genealogy of Mary.
11. Tertullian, ... 134
To the same effect as Clem. Alex.
12. Clementine Homilies, ... 134
Passages showing various degrees of agreement with the canon.
13. Origen, ... 136
Matthew written for the Hebrews. *Various readings and their origin.*
14. Julius Africanus, ... 137
Discrepancy in the genealogies in Matthew and Luke.
15. Eusebius, ... 138
Matthew wrote in Hebrew (πατρίῳ γλώττῃ), and in the Greek used οἰκείᾳ ἐκδόσει.
16. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 139
Matthew wrote in Hebrew.
17. Epiphanius, ... 139
Matthew's Gospel was called "according to the Hebrews," because written in Hebrew.
18. Jerome, ... 139
Matthew wrote in Hebrew; the translator into Greek not known; the original Hebrew was in Cæsarea in Jerome's time; Jerome saw the book in Berœa.

VII.—GOSPEL OF MARK.

(See Note, p. 141.)

1. Papias, ... 141
Mark Peter's interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής).
2. Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, ... 142
Resurrection and ascension of Christ.
3. Justin Martyr, ... 143
Christ a carpenter; the memoirs of Peter (?); special references to the disputed verses, Mark xvi. 9-20.
4. Irenæus, ... 145
Mark was Peter's "interpreter and follower."

5. Athenagoras, ... 146
Reference Mark x. 11, 6.
6. Muratorian Canon, ... 146
See before, p. 5.
7. Clement of Alexandria, ... 146
Narrative of the composition of Mark's Gospel (see note, p. 147).
8. Hippolytus, ... 147
Mark the κολοβοδάκτυλος.
9. Tertullian, ... 148
Mark Peter's interpreter.
10. Origen, ... 148
11. Clementine Homilies, ... 148
12. Eusebius, ... 148
Eusebius says Mark's Gospel is "Memoirs of Peter's Discourses."
13. Epiphanius, ... 149
Mark, Peter's follower, wrote his Gospel in Rome.
14. Jerome, ... 149
Jerome's version of Mark's relation to Peter.
15. Special testimonies to Mark xvi. 9-20, ... 150

VIII.—GOSPEL OF LUKE.

(See Notes, pp. 154, 163, 164, 165, 166.)

1. Barnabas, ... 154
2. Clement of Rome, ... 155
3. Hermas, ... 155
4. Protevangelium Jacobi, ... 156
5. Justin Martyr, ... 156
References especially to the early years of Christ.
6. Letter of Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 158
7. Irenæus, ... 159
Luke was Paul's ἀκόλουθος, and his Gospel is what Paul preached (see note).
8. Tatian, ... 162
9. Athenagoras, ... 162
10. Theophilus, ... 162
11. Clement of Alexandria, ... 162
12. Tertullian, ... 162
Paul was Luke's illuminator.
13. Julius Africanus, ... 163
14. Origen, ... 163
Luke and Mark were of the seventy-two disciples; some say Luke was Lucius, Rom. xvi. 21.
15. Clementine Homilies, ... 163
16. Eusebius, ... 164
Luke an Antiochene; his relations to Paul.
17. Epiphanius, ... 165
18. Jerome, ... 165
Luke a physician.

IX.—GOSPEL OF JOHN

(See Introduction, Chap. XVII.)

1. Papias, ... 167
Used 1 John; another Papias of fourteenth century; MS reference of uncertain date.
2. Barnabas, ... 168
References and coincidences (note, p. 170).
3. Clement of Rome (echoes), ... 170
2 Clem. (quotations); Jerome's citation of 1 Clem.
4. Ignatius, ... 171
5. Basilides, ... 173
Reference to John i., ii.
6. Acts of Pilate, ... 173
John v. 2 (see note, p. 174).
7. Polycarp, ... 174
8. Martyrdom of Polycarp, ... 174
9. Hermas, ... 174
Note, p. 175.
10. Justin Martyr, ... 176
Quotations and references (see note, p. 178).
11. Letter to Diognetus, ... 179
12. Acts of Paul and Thecla, ... 180
13. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 180
14. Tatian, ... 180
15. Athenagoras, ... 181
16. Theophilus, ... 182
Quotation by name.
17. Muratorian Fragment, ... 182
18. Irenæus, ... 182
John survived till Trajan's time; wrote his Gospel in Ephesus; opposed Cerinthus.
19. Polycrates, ... 183
20. Clement of Alexandria, ... 184
21. Tertullian, ... 184
22. Clementine Homilies, ... 184
John iii., ix., x.
23. Valentinus and Ptolemæus, ... 185
24. Origen, ... 185
25. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 185
26. Eusebius, ... 185
27. Epiphanius, ... 186
Why John wrote; the Alogi.
28. Jerome, ... 187
John supplemented the synoptists; lived till Trajan's time.

THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY.

Appendix to Testimonies to John's Gospel.

1. Eusebius (H. E. V. 22, 25), ... 189
Narrative of the controversy in the days of Victor; Irenæus's reminiscences of Polycarp and Anicetus in connection with it, *ibid.*, IV. 26; reference to Melito's work.
2. Hippolytus (Ref. Hær. VIII. 18), ... 192
The observers of the 14th day at issue with the Church.
3. The Paschal Chronicle, 5, 6, &c., ... 193
Christ slain on the 14th; alleged quotations from Hippolytus, Appollinarius, Clement of Alexandria.
4. Epiphanius, ... 195
Various references to the Quartodecimans.

X.—THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

1. Barnabas, ... 196
2. Clement of Rome, ... 196
3. Hermas, ... 196
4. Ignatius, ... 196
5. Polycarp, ... 197
6. Martyrdom of Polycarp, ... 197
7. Papias, ... 197
Supplementary traditions.
8. Dionysius of Corinth, ... 197
9. Justin Martyr, ... 198
10. Letter to Diognetus, ... 198
11. Letter from the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, ... 198
12. Hegesippus, ... 199
13. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, ... 199
14. Muratorian Canon, ... 199
15. Acts of Paul and Thecla, ... 199
16. Irenæus (III. 14, 15), ... 200
Luke the companion of Paul.
17. Tatian, ... 202
18. Athenagoras, ... 202
19. Clement of Alexandria, ... 202
Luke wrote Acts, and translated Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews.
20. Tertullian, ... 203
Luke the author.
21. Clementine Homilies, ... 203
22. Clementine Recognitions, ... 204
Various references, one to Paul as in Acts ix. 1, 2.
23. Origen, ... 205
Luke the writer of Acts.
24. Apostolical Constitutions, ... 205
Luke the author.
25. Eusebius, ... 205
26. Jerome, ... 206
Note on objections to the book.

XI.—THE EPISTLES.

Eusebius (H. E. III. 3), ... 207
The works of Peter (his Epistles, Acts, Gospel, Preaching, Apocalypse); and of Paul (Hebrews disputed, Acts not accepted, the Shepherd of Hermas controverted).

XII.—THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

1. Clement of Rome, ... 209
Paul at the limit of the west, &c.
2. Tatian (Eus. H. E. IV. 29), ... 210
Amended Paul.
3. Caius, ... 210
Did not count Hebrews among Paul's Epistles.
4. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, ... 210
5. Muratorian Canon, ... 211
6. Origen, ... 211
7. Eusebius, ... 211
Paul's history after the end of Acts, as indicated in 2 Timothy, and stated by other writers.
8. Jerome, ... 213
On the same subject, and on Hebrews.

XIII.—EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

1. Barnabas, ... 215
2. Clement of Rome, ... 215
First Epistle; Second Epistle.
3. Ignatius, ... 216
4. Polycarp, ... 216
5. Justin Martyr, ... 217
And note.
6. Letter to Diognetus, ... 217
7. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 218
8. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, ... 218
9. Muratorian Canon, ... 218
10. The Presbyters, ... 218
Of Irenæus.
11. Tatian, ... 219
12. Irenæus, ... 219
Paul by name.
13. Athenagoras, ... 219
14. Theophilus, ... 220
15. Clement of Alexandria, ... 220
16. Tertullian, ... 220
On Rom. xv. and xvi.
17. Origen, ... 221
MSS varying in allocating xvi. 25-27. Note.

XIV.—FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. Barnabas, ... 222
2. Clement of Rome, ... 222
Paul by name, &c.
3. Hermas, ... 224
4. Ignatius, ... 224
5. Polycarp, ... 225
6. Martyrdom of Polycarp, ... 225
7. Justin Martyr, ... 225
8. Letter to Diognetus, ... 226
9. The Presbyters, ... 226
Irenæus.
10. Hegesippus, ... 227
On 1 Cor. ii. 9.
11. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon, . . . 227
12. Tatian, ... 227
13. Athenagoras, ... 228
14. Theophilus, ... 229
15. Irenæus, ... 229
16. Clement of Alexandria, ... 229
17. Tertullian, ... 229

XV.—SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. Clement of Rome, ... 230
2. Ignatius, ... 230
3. Polycarp, ... 230
4. Letter to Diognetus, ... 230
5. Athenagoras, ... 231
6. Theophilus, ... 231
7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon, . . . 231
8. Irenæus, ... 231
Paul by name.
9. The Presbyters, ... 231
Paul by name.
10. Clement of Alexandria, ... 232
11. Tertullian, ... 232

XVI.—GALATIANS.

1. Barnabas, ... 233
2. Clement of Rome, ... 233
3. Ignatius, ... 233
4. Polycarp, ... 233
5. Justin Martyr, ... 234
6. Letter to Diognetus, ... 234
7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon, . . . 234

8. Tatian, ... 234
9. Athenagoras, ... 235
10. Irenæus, ... 235
11. Clement of Alexandria, ... 235
12. Acts of Paul and Thecla, ... 236
13. Tertullian, ... 236
14. Clementine Homilies, ... 236

XVII.—EPHESIANS.

1. Barnabas, ... 237
Note on genuineness.
2. Clement of Rome, ... 238
3. Hermas, ... 238
4. Ignatius, ... 239
5. Polycarp, ... 239
The Epistle is "Scripture."
6. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon, . . . 240
7. Irenæus, ... 240
Names Paul to the Ephesians.
8. Theophilus, ... 240
9. Clement of Alexandria, ... 240
10. Tertullian, ... 241
To Ephesians, not to Laodiceans.
11. Clementine Homilies, ... 241
12. Origen, ... 241
To the Ephesians.
13. Epiphanius, ... 241
On Marcion's Laodiceans compare Tertullian's reference, and see note, p. 242.
14. Jerome, ... 242

XVIII.—PHILIPPIANS.

1. Clement of Rome, ... 243
2. Ignatius, ... 243
3. Polycarp, ... 244
"The blessed and glorified (?) Paul."
4. Martyrdom of Polycarp, ... 244
5. Justin Martyr, ... 244
6. Letter to Diognetus, ... 245
7. Letter of Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 245
8. Irenæus, ... 245
Paul to Philippians.
9. Theophilus, ... 245
According to Jerome, quoted Philippians in his Commentary on the four Gospels in one.
10. Clement of Alexandria, ... 246
11. Tertullian, ... 246

LIBRARY
WEST'N THEO. SEM'Y,
WASHINGTON BOUL'D,
CHICAGO.

XIX.—COLOSSIANS.

Note on Epistle, . . . 247
1. Barnabas, ... 248
2. Clement of Rome, ... 248
3. Ignatius, ... 248
4. Polycarp, ... 248
5. Justin Martyr, ... 248
6. Tatian, ... 249
7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon, . . . 249
8. Irenæus, ... 249
9. Theophilus, ... 249
10. Clement of Alexandria, ... 250
11. Tertullian, ... 250

XX.—FIRST THESSALONIANS.

Note on Epistle, ... 251
1. Barnabas, ... 251
2. Clement of Rome, ... 251
3. Ignatius, ... 251
4. Polycarp, ... 251
5. Syriac, Old Latin, and Muratorian Canon, ... 251
6. Irenæus, ... 252
7. Clement of Alexandria, ... 252
8. Tertullian, ... 252

XXI.—SECOND THESSALONIANS.

Note on Epistle, ... 253
1. Barnabas, ... 253
2. Polycarp, ... 253
3. Justin Martyr, ... 253
4. Irenæus, ... 253
5. Clement of Alexandria, ... 254
6. Tertullian, ... 254

XXII.—FIRST TIMOTHY.

Note on the Pastoral Epistles, ... 255
1. Barnabas, ... 255
2. Clement of Rome, ... 255
3. Ignatius, ... 256
4. Polycarp, ... 257
5. Letter to Diognetus, ... 257
6. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 257
7. Justin Martyr, ... 258
8. Hegesippus, ... 258

9. Syriac, Old Latin, and Muratorian Canon, ... 259
10. Athenagoras, ... 259
11. Theophilus, ... 259
12. Irenæus, ... 259
13. Clement of Alexandria, ... 259
14. Tertullian, ... 260
15. Jerome, ... 260

XXIII.—SECOND TIMOTHY.

1. Barnabas, ... 262
2. Clement of Rome, ... 262
3. Ignatius, ... 262
4. Polycarp, ... 262
5. Athenagoras, ... 263
6. Irenæus, ... 263
7. Clement of Alexandria, ... 263
8. Tertullian, ... 264
9. Origen, ... 264
10. Eusebius, ... 264
(See also p. 211.)

XXIV.—TITUS.

1. Barnabas, ... 266
2. Clement of Rome, ... 266
3. Ignatius, ... 266
4. Irenæus, ... 266
5. Tatian, ... 267
6. Athenagoras, ... 267
7. Theophilus, ... 267
8. Justin Martyr, ... 267
9. Clement of Alexandria, ... 267
10. Tertullian, ... 268

XXV.—PHILEMON.

1. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, Muratorian Canon, . . . 269
2. Tertullian, ... 269
In Marcion's Canon.
3. Origen, ... 269
4. Eusebius, ... 270
5. Jerome, ... 270
Defence against charge of being an unworthy Epistle.

XXVI.—HEBREWS.

Note on the Epistle, ... 272
1. Barnabas, ... 272
2. Clement of Rome, ... 272
3. Ignatius, ... 274

4. Polycarp, ... 275
5. Hermas, ... 275
6. Justin Martyr, ... 275
7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, Muratorian Canon, . . . 276
8. Irenæus, ... 276
9. Pantænus, ... 277
10. Clement of Alexandria, ... 277
11. Tertullian, ... 278
12. Caius (about A.D. 200), ... 279
13. Hippolytus, ... 279
14. Origen, ... 280
15. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 282
16. Cyprian, ... 282
17. Eusebius, ... 283
18. Athanasius, ... 284
19. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 284
20. Epiphanius, ... 284
21. Theodoret, ... 285
22. Jerome, ... 286

XXVII.—THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Note on the Catholic Epistles, ... 289
1. Clement of Alexandria, ... 289
3. Origen, ... 290
4. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 290
5. Eusebius, ... 290
6. Epiphanius, ... 290
7. Jerome, ... 290

XXVIII.—JAMES.

Note on the Epistle, ... 292
1. Clement of Rome, ... 292
2. Hermas, ... 293
3. Ignatius, ... 295
4. Polycarp, ... 295
5. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, Muratorian Canon, . . . 295
6. Irenæus, ... 295
7. Clement of Alexandria, ... 296
8. Hippolytus, ... 296
9. Tertullian, ... 296
Not quotations.
10. Origen, ... 297
Quotes by name; see also notes.
11. Eusebius, ... 298
12. Athanasius, ... 299
13. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 299
14. Epiphanius, ... 299
15. Jerome, ... 299

XXIX.—FIRST PETER.

Note on the Epistle, ... 301
1. Barnabas, ... 302
2. Clement of Rome, ... 302
3. Hermas, ... 303
4. Ignatius, ... 304
5. Polycarp, ... 304
Clear use of 1 Peter.
6. Papias, ... 305
Use of 1 Peter.
7. Letter to Diognetus, ... 306
8. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 306
9. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, and Muratorian Canon, . . . 306
10. Irenæus, ... 307
11. Clement of Alexandria, ... 307
12. Tertullian, ... 307
See note.
13. Origen, ... 308
14. Cyprian, ... 309
15. Eusebius, ... 310
16. Athanasius, ... 310
17. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 311
18. Epiphanius, ... 311
19. Jerome, ... 311

XXX.—SECOND PETER.

Note on the Epistle, ... 312
1. Barnabas, ... 313
2. Clement of Rome, ... 313
See notes.
3. Hermas, ... 313
4. Ignatius, ... 314
See note, p. 313.
5. Polycarp, ... 314
6. Justin Martyr, ... 314
7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, and Muratorian Canon, . . . 314
8. Melito, ... 314
9. Irenæus, ... 315
10. Theophilus, ... 315
11. Clement of Alexandria, ... 316
See note.
12. Origen, ... 316
13. Firmilian, ... 317
14. Eusebius, ... 317
15. Athanasius, ... 317
16. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 317
17. Gregory of Nazianzum, ... 318
18. Epiphanius, ... 318
19. Jerome, ... 318

XXXI.—FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

Note on the Epistle, ... 319
1. Barnabas, ... 319
2. Clement of Rome, ... 320
3. Hermas, ... 320
4. Ignatius, ... 320
5. Polycarp, ... 320
Clear quotation.
6. Papias, ... 321
Used the Epistle.
7. Justin Martyr, ... 321
8. Letter to Diognetus, ... 321
9. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 321
10. Muratorian Canon, ... 321
Names two (perhaps three) Epistles of John.
11. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, ... 322
Contain it.
12. Irenæus, ... 322
Quotes.
13. Clement of Alexandria, ... 322
Quotes.
14. Tertullian, ... 323
Quotes.
15. Origen, ... 323
Quotes, see note.
16. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 324
17. Cyprian, ... 324
18. Eusebius, ... 325
19. Athanasius, ... 325
20. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 325
21. Epiphanius, ... 326
22. Jerome, ... 326

XXXII.—SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

Note on the two Epistles, ... 327
1. Polycarp, ... 328
2. Ignatius, ... 328
3. Irenæus, ... 328
4. Clement of Alexandria, ... 328
5. Origen, ... 329
6. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 329
7. Cyprian, ... 329
8. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, ... 329
9. Eusebius, ... 329
10. Athanasius, ... 330
11. Laodicene Council, A.D. 364, ... 330
12. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 330
13. Epiphanius, ... 330
14. Jerome, ... 330

XXXIII.—JUDE.

Note on the Epistle, ... 331
1. Barnabas, ... 331
2. Hermas, ... 331
3. Polycarp, ... 331
4. Muratorian Canon, ... 332
Contains it.
5. Syriac and Old Latin Versions, ... 332
Old Latin contains it, Syriac wants it.
6. Irenæus, ... 332
Doubtful.
7. Clement of Alexandria, ... 332
Quoted and commented on Jude.
8. Tertullian, ... 333
On Book of Enoch and the "Apostle Jude."
9. Origen, ... 333
Quotes, see note.
10. Eusebius, ... 335
11. Athanasius, ... 335
12. Cyril of Jerusalem, ... 335
13. Epiphanius, ... 335
14. Jerome, ... 335

XXXIV.—APOCALYPSE.

(For general note see p. 357.)
1. Barnabas, ... 336
2. Clement of Rome, ... 336
3. Hermas, ... 336
See note.
4. Ignatius, ... 338
5. Papias, ... 338
See note.
6. Justin Martyr, ... 339
Quotes as by the Apostle John.
7. Melito, ... 339
8. Apollonius, ... 340
Quotes.
9. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, ... 340
Quotes.
10. Irenæus, ... 340
Quotes by name as by the Apostle John; see note.
11. Athenagoras, ... 342
12. Theophilus, ... 342
13. Clement of Alexandria, ... 342
Cites as Scripture.
14. Tertullian, ... 343

15. Caius, ... 343
Ascribed it to Cerinthus; see note.
16. Muratorian Fragment, ... 344
Names it as John's.
17. Syriac (wants it) and Old Latin Versions (contain it), . . . 344
18. Origen, ... 344
The Apostle John's.
19. Hippolytus, ... 345
Gospel and Apocalypse by the Apostle.
20. Dionysius of Alexandria, ... 345
Not by the Apostle; see his arguments indicated in successive paragraphs.
21. Cyprian, ... 350
22. Methodius, ... 351
23. Victorinus Petavionensis, ... 351
24. Pamphilus, ... 352
25. Lactantius, ... 352
26. Eusebius, ... 352
The rank of the book doubtful; see p. 11 and note.
27. Athanasius, ... 353
28. Cyril, ... 353
Omits the book.
29. Epiphanius, ... 353
By John.
30. Hilary, ... 355
31. Jerome, ... 355
Note on Chapter XXXIV., ... 357

PART II.

TESTIMONIES OF HEATHEN.

1. Tacitus (A.D. 61 to about A.D. 120), ... 361
2. Martial (A.D. 60 to A.D. 100), ... 362
3. Pliny's letter asking directions from Trajan, ... 362
4. The Emperor's reply to Pliny, ... 364
5. Suetonius (A.D. 121), ... 364
6. Letter of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus (about A.D. 130), . . 364
7. Letter of Hadrian to Servianus, ... 366
8. Antoninus Pius (Marcus Aurelius?) *πρὸς τὸ Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας* (A.D. 148?), 367
9. Lucian (A.D. 176), ... 368
10. Celsus (about A.D. 178), ... 369
See note; on the Gospels; references to Matthew; to Mark and Luke; to John; to apocryphal narratives; to the Epistles.
11. Porphyry (end of third century), ... 378
12. Chrysostom on Celsus and Porphyry, ... 379

PART III.

TESTIMONIES OF HERETICS.

1. Simon Magus (contemporary of Paul), ... 383
Note on; Irenæus; Hippolytus on Simon.
2. Cerinthus (contemporary of John), ... 384
Note on; Epiphanius on.
3. Naassenes or Ophites (first century), ... 385
Note on; Hippolytus on; subdivisions of Ophites, Peratæ, Sethiani, Justin.
4. Basilides and Isidorus (A.D. 125), ... 389
See Introduction; testimonies from, and criticisms on.
5. Marcion (about A.D. 140; see p. 75, note), ... 393
1. Note on Marcion; Justin on, p. 393; 2. Testimony of the Fathers to the character and object of Marcion's work, 394; 3. Contents of Marcion's Gospel (in comparison with Luke's Gospel), 400; 4. Marcion and the Epistles, 408; 5. Marcion's Apostolicon, 409.
6. Carpocrates (contemporary of Basilides), ... 411
Note on; testimonies by.
7. Valentinus (A.D. 140), ... 413
Note on; testimonies by; examples of Valentinian quotation or interpretation, with notes.
8. Heracleon (A.D. 140-160), ... 419
Note on; testimonies to; and note on "Colarbasus;" specimens of writings of Heracleon.
9. Ptolemæus (contemporary of Heracleon), ... 422
Note on; his position, and quotations of Scripture.
10. Marcus, ... 424
Note on Marcus and Marcosians; quotations of Scripture; Prepon (a Marcionite).
11. Docetæ, ... 425
Note on Docetæ (and on Monoïmus); Hippolytus's report of Docetic quotations.
12. Theodotus, ... 426
Note on Theodotus; several of the name; use of the Gospels (John's included) and the Epistles; Theodotus as quoted by Epiphanius.
13. Apelles (contemporary of Marcion), ... 429
Note on Apelles; his quotations of Scripture.
14. Julius Cassianus, ... 431
15. The Ebionites, ... 431
Note on the Ebionites; their treatment of Scripture.
16. The Montanists or Cataphrygians, ... 434
Note on the Montanists; their tenets.
17. The Alogi, ... 436
Note on the Alogi; possible allusions in Irenæus and Eusebius; testimony of Epiphanius.

LIBRARY
WEST'N THEO. SEM'Y,
WASHINGTON BOUL'D,
CHICAGO.

18. Clementine Homilies, ... 428
Quotations in the Homilies from the Gospels and from unknown sources (most of the passages under descriptive headings); note on use made of other books of the N. T. in the Homilies.
19. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, . . . 445
Note on; quotations from.
[*Table of the Lists of the Heretics given by Irenæus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Pseudo-Tertullian, and Theodoret*], . . 447

PART IV.

EXTRA-CANONICAL GOSPELS.

1. Gospel of the Hebrews, ... 451
A. Testimonies to its existence, ... 451
1. Ignatius, ... 451
2. Hegesippus, ... 451
3. Papias, ... 452
4. Irenæus, ... 452
5. Clement of Alexandria, ... 452
6. Origen, ... 452
7. Eusebius, ... 453
8. Jerome, ... 453
9. Theodoret (A.D. 451-458), ... 455
10. Nicephorus (A.D. 758-828), ... 455
11. Epiphanius, ... 456
B. Quotations from its Nazarene or its Ebionite form—Epiphanius, Jerome, Irenæus, Eusebius, Origen, &c., ... 456
2. Protevangelium Jacobi, ... 464
3. Acts of Pilate, ... 464
4. Gospel of Peter, and note, ... 466
5. Gospel of Egyptians, ... 468
Passages of Unknown Origin occurring in Early Writers, . 470

INTRODUCTION.

I.—BARNABAS.

Though we have no very early—certainly no contemporary—reference to this Epistle, the first references with which we meet are both explicit and harmonious.[1] Clement of Alexandria, who is said to have written a short commentary upon it, and who certainly quotes it repeatedly, calls it the work of the Apostle Barnabas. Origen calls it the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas. The "Apostolical Constitutions" (date uncertain) quote, or rather appropriate, chapters 18-20 of this Epistle. It appears, therefore, that at the end of the second and beginning of the third century the Alexandrian Church regarded this letter as genuine and important. Neither Clement nor Origen can be fairly charged with assigning to it a place among the canonical Scriptures. But when we find it in the Cod. Sin. after the books of the New Testament, we see grounds for ascribing to it liturgical if not canonical authority in the estimation of the Alexandrian Church of the fourth century. Eusebius (H. E. III. 26) numbers it among the spurious (ἐν τοῖς νόθοις). It is doubtful whether he meant by this that the Epistle was not the

[1] Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. ex. Can. Rec., Fasc. iv. p. 94) finds Barnabas, c. 18, 21, in the fragmentary *Duæ viæ vel Judicium Petri*. The same passage is also said to be silently appropriated in Apost. Const., Book vii. 1-18. But the whole basis is uncertain, and the dates are hypothetical. This ethical portion of Barnabas, c. 18, 20, which is in some measure a paraphrase of the Sermon on the Mount, corresponds to another paraphrase which is found amongst other matter in the Apost. Const., and parts of it are also found in the short homilies ascribed to various Apostles (John, Matthew, Peter, Andrew, Philip, Simon, James, Nathanael, Thomas, Cephas, and Bartholomew) in αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων (see Hilg. N. T., Fasc. iv. p. 95 *et seq.*), which Hilg. regards as the *Duæ viæ vel Judicium Petri*. But while in Barnabas, c. 18, in Apost. Const., c. 1, and in those διαταγαί (which are a shorter and probably earlier form of the Apostolical Constitutions), we have a formal beginning, "There are two ways," &c., we have not such a correspondence in detail as to be of much use in deciding questions of date or authorship; and to appeal to that *Duæ viæ*, &c., in order to decide on the date of Barnabas, is like going from twilight to darkness for a clearer view.

work of Barnabas, or merely that it was not canonical. Jerome, however, unhesitatingly calls it apocryphal, though he does not say that it is not genuine. In the Western Church we have no proof (save the existence of an old Latin version of the first seventeen chapters[1]) that the Epistle had at any time a place in the regard of Christian communities. It does not seem to have been known in the west before the fourth century: it was forgotten even in the east after the seventh or eighth.

The Cod. Sin. is the only complete Greek text which has been published in full; but Hilgenfeld (1877) made known the readings in another text discovered by Bryennios. The readings in the Cod. Sin. are often corrupt, and in some cases appeal is made by editors to the old Latin version for guidance. (See reference to Bryennios below, p. viii.)

If we ask whether this Epistle is really the work of Paul's comrade, all the early positive testimony which we have makes us answer that it is; but there is no little weight in the negative testimony, which shows us that its reputation was always local, and even in the locality short-lived. The witnesses (Clem. Alex., Origen, and Jerome) were not contemporaries of Barnabas; and their evidence goes no further than to assure us of the repute in which the production was held in their day. Even in regard to Clement's frequent use of it, we must add that while he quotes, he holds himself at liberty to criticise and blame it. There seems to have been in his mind, and still more probably in the minds of those who came after him, an instinctive conviction that even though Barnabas might be the author, the Epistle was not a rule for Christians. And this instinct continued to gain strength until Alexandrian Christians forgot what the rest of Christendom continued to disregard.

Nor is the reason far to seek. The arguments in the Epistle are such as would find their chief popularity in Alexandria; but even there they could only be popular for a short time. They go to prove the superiority of Christianity to Judaism; of inner or mystical knowledge (γνῶσις) to the mere acceptance of the letter of the Old Testament; and what Paul in Galatians had done for all men, his friend was supposed in Alexandria to have done by this epistle in a way specially acceptable to mystics. The coincidence of the author's purpose with that of good men in Alexandria prevented their testing his assertions, or carefully estimating the probability of his being "Barnabas." But the temporary acceptance soon came to an end; and this, in all probability, because the early Church felt what modern critics have almost unanimously agreed in stating. The Barnabas of the New Testament was a Jew, a Levite, more Jewish in his leanings than

[1] This Latin version has for title "Epistola Barnabæ:" see Gebhardt, Proleg., p. xxix.

Paul (Gal. ii. 13); but the author of this Epistle denounces Jewish sacrifices (c. 2) and Jewish fasts (c. 3) in a way foreign to Paul; he declares (c. 4) that Jews lost their covenant rights when Moses broke the tables of the law, &c. He attempts to describe the ceremonies of the great day of atonement (c. 7), and to treat the red heifer as a type of Christ (c. 8), but is so incorrect in his statements as to show that he "was neither accurately acquainted with the text of the law, nor had even seen the celebration of the day of atonement."[1] His position in regard to Judaism is therefore not that of Barnabas. And another argument against his being the companion of Paul and of the other Apostles may well be found in the famous passage where, desirous of proving Christ's power as a Saviour, he says, "When He chose His own apostles who were to preach His Gospel, He chose those who were lawless beyond the bounds of all ordinary sin, that He might show He came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς—c. 5). We can scarcely imagine that this was spoken of the other Apostles by one who had known their goodness and truth, and who, if he wrote the Epistle at all, wrote it after the destruction of Jerusalem, when of them all only John survived.

It seems impossible in the face of such internal evidence to accept the statements of Clem. Alex. and Origen; or if they are accepted as to the author's name, we are bound to suppose that this Barnabas was not the companion of St Paul. But for critical purposes, it is perhaps more important to come to some conclusion as to the date than as to the authorship. If it were written by the Barnabas of whom we read in our New Testament, it must be a production of the first century. From the silence of the New Testament as to any proceedings of Barnabas in the last period of St Paul's life, we should not suppose that he was alive at the siege of Jerusalem. This Epistle, however, is evidently written after the fall of the temple—*i.e.*, after A.D. 70.[2]

But this is all that is evident. Some critics have tried to show that at the time when the Epistle was written, hopes were enter-

[1] Donaldson, Apostolical Fathers (1874), p. 256. See the whole argument summed up by Dr Donaldson.

[2] We may here quote from c. 16 the passage on which the question of date chiefly turns. The last sentence is ambiguous, but the whole may be rendered as follows: "Yet again I shall speak to you about the temple, how those ill-fated and misguided creatures set their hopes upon the building, and not upon their God and Creator, as though the mere building were the house of God." Then he quotes Isaiah xl. 12, lxvi. 1, xlix. 17, to show how vain was the Jewish hope; and goes on to quote, "Again says the Lord, *Behold, they who destroy this temple shall themselves build it.* This is fulfilled, for because of their making war it was destroyed by the enemies. And now also they, and the servants of the enemies, shall build it anew from the foundation." After a little he says, "Let us ask whether there is a temple of God;" and he answers "there is"—but he goes on to show that it is "a spiritual temple built by the Lord."

tained that the temple was about to be rebuilt by Jews in co-operation with Gentiles. It is quite true that he goes on to speak of a spiritual temple; but he is meanwhile speaking of a temple which enemies could destroy, and Jews along with enemies could rebuild, and this must be a material temple. The conclusion therefore is, that we have a date early in Hadrian's reign, before Hadrian turned against the Jews. There is evidence that the Jews did expect him to favour them about this time. Within the short period when this expectation was cherished, our "Barnabas" is supposed to have written,—*i.e.*, about A.D. 120. It must be admitted that some straining is needed to make us fix on that particular time. All that can be fairly concluded from the passage is, that the author seems to have had some idea of a possible reconstruction of the temple, when the Jews, along with servants of Rome (or, according to another reading, themselves acting as servants of Rome), would rebuild it.[1]

There is another passage (c. 4) in which the author seems to give an indication of his date by quoting Daniel vii. 4 and vii. 7, but here too certainty fails us. That there are ten kings past, and that a little king would rise to crush three, may be accepted as the meaning; but who were the ten, and who was the eleventh? Who was the first, and who were the τρεῖς ὑφ' ἕν? Vespasian, Nerva, and Domitian have been suggested as the eleventh; and the arguments for Domitian would be clear if we could see how to say of Domitian in relation to his predecessors ἐταπείνωσεν τρεῖς ὑφ' ἕν.[2] As things are, we must pass the apocalyptic riddle by,—perhaps with a suspicion that "Barnabas" himself had no very clear notion how to read it.

There is a reference in Origen (C. Cels., I. 63), who quotes from Celsus some misrepresentation of the character of the Apostles, and adds that Celsus probably picked up the idea from the passage in Barnabas (ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι). This shows Origen's belief that "Barnabas" was accessible to Celsus, and indicates for Barnabas a date not later than the middle of the second century. But the date of Celsus himself is not very certain, and we get from this nothing more than a limit.

On the whole, therefore, we cannot be sure of the date. There is in the whole tone of the Epistle, however, something that makes us feel it necessary to regard Jerusalem as in ruins;[3] and Ælia Capitolina,

[1] I cannot see that Hilgenfeld, N. T., p. 75 *et seq.*, has succeeded in disposing of all reference to the material temple; or that Dr Donaldson's arguments, p. 267 *et seq.*, bring him to his conclusion, p. 273, for a date within the first quarter of the second century.

[2] The Sibylline Oracles, B. v., say, "Τρεῖς ἄρξουσιν, ὁ δὲ τρίτος ὑψὲ κρατήσει πάντων." This comes after a description of the Roman emperors down to Hadrian, so that the three are probably Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, and Commodus. A similar passage occurs in B. viii., where it is said that three reigns come between Hadrian and the end of the world. See Lardner, vol. ii. p. 337.

[3] See Hefele, Proleg., p. xiii.

A.D. 119, as not yet founded. And when we add this to the passage (c. 4) describing an apparent expectation in the writer's own mind that the old temple would be built up again, we may probably conclude with the majority of recent writers that A.D. 119 or A.D. 120 is after all a likely time for it being written. But there is not really any very cogent reason against going back to an earlier time soon after the fall of Jerusalem, and so finding ourselves almost in the very age of the Apostles.[1] That the apostolic Barnabas wrote it, is however an untenable theory.

We next ask to whom the Epistle was addressed. It would take us too long to recount all the opinions on this subject, and the arguments by which they have been supported. We may say in a word, that the author seems to have regarded his readers as an ordinary Christian community,—his arguments being such as all needed, and all might appreciate. He appears to have had a special church in view. The majority were probably Gentiles by birth, but there is nothing to prevent one believing that there was a Jewish element among them.[2]

That the writer himself was accustomed to use Greek we may safely conjecture from c. 9, and from the same passage we may suppose that he was under Alexandrian influence. When he argues that Abraham circumcised 318 persons of his household, and that in doing so he was looking forward to Jesus "embodying the lessons taught by three letters" (ΤΙΗ λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων δόγματα), he not only speaks as a Greek, but makes Abraham's thoughts run in the same mould! "What, then, was the wisdom (γνῶσις) given in this? . . . The eighteen are ΙΗ—there you have Jesus (Ἰησοῦς). And because the cross was to express the grace (of our redemption) by the letter T, he says also 300. Thus he shows Jesus in the two letters (ΙΗ), and the cross in the one letter T." "No one," he complacently adds, "ever learned a more capital bit of knowledge from me than this; but I know that ye are worthy." From this passage we may conclude that the writer was a Greek writing to Greeks, and probably a Greek trained in the logomachy of Alexandria. It does not seem from the Epistle as a whole that he was acquainted with any of the systems of Christian Gnosticism; but he represents significantly the tendencies to overvalue γνῶσις, and to regard the allegorising of Old Testament history as an important branch of γνῶσις, which afterwards issued in these systems. In answer to the question whether Barnabas quotes our canonical Gospels, we may refer to the passages in our text. We have

[1] Thus Lardner says A.D. 71 or 72. The passage, c. 4, 14 (see our text, under the head of Barnabas), seems to point to a time (not, indeed, when signs and wonders were seen, but) when Israel was utterly abandoned; and one thinks of the abandonment as recent. "Between the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the reduction of the remaining cities of Judea, of which Josephus has given an account after the burning of the temple."—Lardner.

[2] Even c. 14, 5, and c. 16, 7, may be interpreted as confirming this.

as good evidence as can be reasonably required for his use of our St Matthew in c. 4, 14—c. 5, 9; and the other passages, while probably confirmatory of this usage, are not to be regarded as evidence of it. The attempts to find references to Luke are not very successful. From John there is not any absolute quotation, although there are several interesting passages, in which the parallelism of thought is suggestive.[1] The correspondence in thought and theology between this Epistle and the fourth Gospel--still more perhaps between Barnabas and the first Epistle of John—is too striking to be left unnoticed. "The 'Son of God' must manifest Himself in the flesh, and come through death and the cross to His kingly power, must bring life and divine abiding—that is in both compositions the ruling thought. He existed before the foundation of the world, was the sender of the prophets, the subject of prophecy, seen before by Abraham, and prefigured in the person of Moses as Israel's only hope." So said Keim,[2] in words which are not to be forgotten, though he himself may seem at a later time to draw back somewhat from the conclusion to which they lead.[3] Not only does Barnabas regard Christ's incarnation in the same way as John does, but the facts of Christ's life as recorded by John seem to be the indispensable basis of the theology of Barnabas. It is not possible to avoid this conclusion, by speaking of both as products of the Alexandrian school, because the most Alexandrian portion of John—the doctrine of the Logos—is conspicuous by its absence in Barnabas.

This leads us to observe further, that the Epistle of Barnabas is so much more theological than Clement, as to have much the same resemblance to it which John has to the Synoptists. It is quite true that he is not a clear theologian; that his use of Old Testament types is hard and over-refined, and that his general disquisitions are cumbrous; and that, as we have seen, his knowledge of Old Testament history and ritual is extremely inaccurate: but all this must not cause us to forget how pure is his theology,—how unfaltering is his faith in the one Almighty Maker and Ruler of all,—and how his constant endeavour is to show that the Son of God was incarnate, and taught, and suffered, and died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living. And when he comes[4] to teach the practical duties of the Christian life, he shows a tenderness of feeling and a beauty of expression that make us almost ready to think that he was none other than the "good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith," of whom we read in Acts xi. 24.

[1] See under head of "John" the references to Barnabas.

[2] Jesu v. Nazar. (1867), vol. i. pp. 141-143. Compare Keim's Gesch. Jesu (1873), p. 41, where he makes the date of John A.D. 130.

[3] See Geb. and Har., p. xl.

[4] Although the second part (chaps. 18-21) is not in the old Latin version, the MS authority and the internal resemblances seem to combine in justifying the conclusion that it is an integral part of the Epistle.

In conclusion, we may note that in the theology of this Epistle we find no proof of a chasm between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church. In the author's views of "life," of "life-giving," of Christ's "blood," of the "forgiveness of sin," we have unstudied agreement now with one, now with the other of the great Apostles. In his view of the Old Testament he is too individual and absurd to resemble any one of the canonical writers; but if some controversialist conclude from this that he is merely "ultra Pauline," he has to account for the other passages where we seem to have an echo of the teachings of John or James.[1]

[The relation of Barnabas to the Fourth Gospel is to be studied as a matter of thought and of theology, rather than of verbal quotation or parallelism. (See Introduction, "Barnabas.") But the following passages are at least suggestive:—

C. 5, 6. *αὐτὸς δὲ, ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν. ζῆν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (c. 6, 3; c. 8, 5; c. 11, 10, 11). Compare John vi. 51, 58, &c.

6, 6. *ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν*—John xix. 24, same quotation. See also Justin, Ap. I. 38.

6, 7. *ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος φανεροῦσθαι καὶ πάσχειν, προεφανερώθη τὸ πάθος.* Compare John i. 31; 1 John i. 2; iii. 5, 8; also 1 Tim. iii. 16.

5, 6; 6, 7. . . . *φανερωθῆναι ἐν σαρκί . . . φανεροῦσθαι*, &c. See John xix. 34.[2]

7, 2. *εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς.* Compare John v. 21, ff. See *ζωοποιήσει*, C. 12, 5.

7, 9. *κατακεντήσαντες.* Compare John xix. 37.

11, 17. *ζωοποιούμενοι ζήσομεν*, &c.

19, 12. *οὐ προσήξεις ἐπὶ προσευχὴν ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ*=John ix. 31, *ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει.*

21, 2. *ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς οὓς ἐργάσησθε*=John xii. 8, *τοὺς πτωχοὺς πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν.*

21, 6. *θεοδίδακτοι*=*διδακτοὶ (τοῦ) Θεοῦ*—John vi. 45.]

---

[1] In regard to quotations from Old Testament Apocryphal Books, we may say that the only one beyond doubt is from Sirach iv. 31 (see Barnabas, c. 19, 9). The other passages (Enoch in c. iv. 3, and c. xvi. 5; Esdras, c. xii. 1; and Sirach in c. iv. 26) are, for various reasons, not to be relied upon as quotations. See Donaldson, p. 304 *et seq.*

[2] On the other hand, it has been said that the words of Barnabas, c. 5, 13 ("*ἔδει γὰρ ἵνα ἐπὶ ξύλου πάθῃ· λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφητεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ· Φείσαί μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας*"), could not have been written had the author known what John says of the Roman soldier's spear—John xix. 34. But this by no means follows.

II.—CLEMENT OF ROME.

First Epistle.

Clement's place in the traditions of the early Church is a very prominent one. After the chief apostles, there is no man to whom the Christians of the second and third centuries more frequently looked back. Numerous works falsely ascribed to him were partly the effect and partly the cause of his celebrity. Several Epistles[1] bear his name; certain "Homilies" and "Recognitions" also; a Liturgy; and the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions. There is now little doubt that the only one of those works which can be fairly reckoned as his is the epistle from "the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth," commonly known as the First Epistle of Clement. We must accept it as written by him in name of the Church, although no trace of his personal authorship appears in its contents. It is through out a letter from church to church. Its testimony to the canonical Scriptures is specially important, because it is undoubtedly of very early date.

Until lately, only one MS of this interesting letter was known to exist, and it is incomplete. It forms part of the Codex Alexandrinus (Cod. A) in the British Museum. There was a gap in its contents; but in 1875 critics and students were startled by the appearance of a careful and complete edition published in Constantinople from a MS discovered in the "library of the Holy Sepulchre" in that city. Its editor is Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serræ. Six new chapters[2] (containing among other interesting matter a prayer of singular beauty[3]) are added by this new MS to the text of Cod. A. In the same book published by Bryennios is contained also a complete edition of the so-called "Second Epistle of Clement," which is manifestly not an Epistle, but a Homily. The learned and fortunate editor promised to issue in due time the other works found in the same MS volume,

[1] As we shall see afterwards, there are epistles in Greek, in Syriac, and in Latin ascribed to Clement.

[2] Chaps. 58 to 63.

[3] The prayer—the oldest public prayer of the Christian Church—is partially incorporated in the "Apostolical Constitutions." Dr Donaldson (Theol. Rev., No. lvi.) has pointed out that the prayer claims (c. 59, c. 63, see also c. 56) inspiration and authority, and this in some degree accounts for the reverence paid to the epistle in the early Church. The liturgies of the early Church resemble this prayer in many of their phrases. See Lightfoot's Clement, and also 'Princeton Review,' April 1877, p. 340.

including 'The Doctrine of the Apostles,' 'Barnabas,'[1] and the 'Ignatian Letters.'

Scarcely was this discovery realised when a Syriac MS of the "Two Epistles" was also found (1876) in Paris. We are now therefore in possession of three MSS, with apparently quite independent testimonies, whereby the text of this early Christian work—'Clement's First Epistle'—can be fairly decided upon.

That it is indeed a very early work there can be no reasonable doubt. Traditional testimony consistently establishes the existence and prominence of a letter of "Clement to the Corinthians," and furnishes us also with a key to its characteristics, as written by him in name of his Church. "The Epistle which you wrote to us by Clement" is the description of it by Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writing to the Romans about A.D. 170. (Eus. H. E. IV. 23.)[2] It was habitually read in the Church of Corinth in the end of the second century; it was evidently used by the author of the Epistle of Polycarp;[3] and both Eusebius and Jerome tell us that it was still publicly read in some churches in their times. Its position at the end of Cod. A as an appendix to the New Testament, and the even higher honour paid to it by the newly-found Syriac MS, which inserts it in the middle of the New Testament after the Catholic Epistles, can be no ground of surprise. We must conclude that what we have in our hands is the Epistle so highly valued in the early Church.[4]

But still there remain two questions: (1) As to the existence of a Clement with such a position as the general acceptance of his Epistle seems to imply; and (2) as to the reasons for ascribing to Clement the authorship of this particular Epistle.

(1) That there was a Clement of note in the early Church we must accept as a fact, notwithstanding the fabulous additions which have been made to it. Irenæus (B. III. 33) tells us that Peter and Paul gave the office of oversight to Linus (mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21); that he was succeeded by Anencletus; and that Clement, who had seen the Apostles, and had conversed with them, and had been taught by them, was third in succession. Even if we doubt some points of this narrative, there are no good grounds for doubting the shorter statement which we owe to Eusebius, that Clement succeeded Anencletus,

[1] On Barnabas he sent his readings to Hilgenfeld, who published an edition making use of them in 1877. See before, p. ii.

[2] Cod. A has it as "Clement's First Epistle," both in the subscription at the end of the epistle itself and in the Index of Books at the end of the New Testament. The Cod. found by Bryennios has it also as "Clement's First Epistle;" so too the Syriac.

[3] See Hefele; Geb. and Har., Proleg., p. lvii.

[4] In the newly-found chapters is a notable reference to the Holy Trinity: "For as God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit liveth—the faith and hope of the Elect—so assuredly," &c. Until the edition of Bryennios appeared, this was only known in a quotation by Basil, and was the occasion of much perplexity.

whose bishopric of twelve years had begun at the same time as the reign of Domitian.[1] Elsewhere Eusebius says he died in the third year of Trajan's reign. This gives us 93 A.D. to 101 A.D. as the term of Clement's episcopate. Tertullian[2] also directly connects Clement with Peter, saying, in his fervid way, that he was ordained by Peter;—saying it so as to lead some to suppose that Clement was the first overseer of the Roman Church after the Apostles. This was a widespread tradition in the Western Church at a later time; but it probably took its shape from the fact that his is the first prominent name in the post-apostolic ministry.

(2) What, then, are our grounds for connecting this disciple of the Apostles, and overseer of the Roman Church (whether he were the first or not), with the Epistle under consideration?[3]

"*Hermas*" (about A.D. 140) says Clement's function was to send works to foreign Churches. There is some doubt as to whether this was the Roman Clement; but *Dionysius* (A.D. 170) says Clement's Epistle was read in the Church of Corinth every Lord's Day. *Hegesippus*, who was at Corinth on his way to Rome about the year A.D. 140[4] (Pius being Bishop), seems to have read the Epistle at Corinth, and there is no good ground to doubt (although this is not explicitly said by Eusebius) that he speaks of it as Clement's. He also says explicitly that the commotions in the Corinthian Church occurred in Clement's time; and, as *Irenæus*[5] is equally explicit on this point, we have the strongest ground for connecting him with the Epistle, the subject of which is so clearly those commotions. The words of Irenæus are: "ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ Κλήμεντος." *Clement of Alexandria*[6] quotes it repeatedly, calling it at one time Clement's, at another the Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians. There is doubt as to *Origen's* use of the Epistle, but none as to his regard for Clement. *Eusebius* sums up the evidence very fairly by saying that "Clement was universally recognised as the author of the first Epistle written by him to the Corinthians, bearing to be by the Roman Church."[7]

Age of the Epistle.

As the date of Clement's "Episcopate" (we may use this word without attempting to fix its exact meaning) is a matter of controversy, we cannot decide the date of the Epistle off-hand, by reference to the time already fixed for his presidency of the Church of Rome. But from the Epistle itself we learn that its despatch had been delayed by reason of certain sudden and successive calamities which fell upon the writers (c. 1). It appears that this was not the persecution in which the Apostles

[1] H. E. III. 34.
[2] De Præscr. Hæret., p. xxxii.
[3] See Geb. and Har., p. lx.
[4] See Geb. and Har., p. lx.
[5] B. III. 3; see Eus. H. E. V. 6.
[6] Strom. I. 7, p. 338; IV. 17, 105, p. 610, &c.
[7] Eus. H. E. III. 39.

Peter and Paul met their end, for that end is elsewhere spoken of as a matter of somewhat remote history (c. 5). It is not possible, therefore, to suppose that the Epistle dates from the time of Nero; and yet it appears as if the generation of the writers had witnessed the departure of the Apostles. Their words are: "But passing by all ancient examples, let us come to the combatants nearest our own time. Let us take the illustrious examples of our own generation" (c. 5, 1). And then comes an account of Peter and Paul. We may suppose, therefore, that it was written within some twenty or thirty years of the Apostles' time. This reference is confirmed by another passage, which tells us that some of those bishops who had been appointed by the Apostles, or other notable men, with the consent of the Church, were dead, while others were still alive. In the newly discovered c. 63, it is said that the messengers are "men who have lived blamelessly among us from youth to old age" (c. 44, 2, 3).

In addition to those indications which its express statements give, we must note one or two furnished by its silence. It is silent as to Gnostic errors,[1] and must, therefore, have been written before the beginning of the second century,—a date at which we know that Gnostic teachers came to Rome. It is silent as to any persecutions of more than a local character, and therefore must have been written before the widespread suffering of Trajan's time (A.D. 115). It is silent as to the controversy regarding the relations of bishop and presbyter. From these indications,[2] positive and negative, we may conclude that its date cannot be earlier than 80, nor later than 100, of our era.

Now Hegesippus tells us that it was written in the time of Domitian. If we refer to his reign the calamities spoken of, we get for our date A.D. 93, or a year not long after.[3] It is by no means improbable that Clement, Bishop of Rome and writer of this Epistle, is the same as Clement nephew of Vespasian, and consul of the city, who was slain in the year 96 A.D. This is at least a much more likely identification than that which makes the Clement of the Epistle the person praised by Paul in Phil. iv. 3. But, be it as it may, the date and authorship may be regarded as settled in favour of the Roman Clement, and the last decade of the century. The earlier date about 69 A.D. does not appear to be at all well supported, even on the showing of its advocates; and it does not seem possible for them to meet the objections already adduced.

[1] The word γνῶσις is repeatedly used without the technical meaning so common in the second century. Compare c. 36, 2; c. 40, 1; c. 41, 4; c. 48, 5. The last of these passages is not very clear, but the others may rule its rendering: see 1 Cor. xii. 8 for similar use of the word.

[2] It is impossible to found upon the phrases "in the beginning of the Gospel," "the ancient church of the Corinthians" (c. 47) as evidences for a late date, the terms being obviously relative (see Phil. iv. 15).

[3] See Gebhardt and Harnack, Proleg., § 7.

Evidence as to the Canon of the New Testament.

There can be no doubt that in respect of Scripture incidents, so far as he refers to them, and in respect of Christian doctrine and morality, Clement is entirely in accord with the New Testament. Nor can there be any doubt of his knowing the writings of St Paul. "Take up," he says, "the Epistle of the blessed Paul, the Apostle. What first of all did he write to you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he spiritually enjoined you concerning himself, and Cephas and Apollos, because that then also ye had formed partialities," &c. (c. 47). Very many passages may be adduced, in which his words seem echoes of expressions in the other New Testament Epistles, as 1 Peter, Timothy, and Titus. The resemblance to the Epistle to the Hebrews is so marked as to have led to the theory that Clement wrote it as well as this Epistle. To these general statements we may add that in appealing to words of Jesus he uses expressions closely corresponding with those in our Gospels.

But these general remarks bring us to the very centre of the battle-field. Does Clement quote our canonical Gospels? or do his words seem to come from some different though kindred source? Admitting, as it is only fair to do, that his words give by no means continuous verbal coincidence with the passages in the Gospels which they resemble, we have to inquire whether the divergence is inconsistent with the theory of quotation. And this again compels us to take up a prior question—viz., how did men quote in those days, and, more especially, how did Clement himself quote? Without entering fully on the subject of the mode of quotations, we may simply say that when men had to consult rolls, and not books, they were not likely to refer to their authority in every instance. As might be expected, therefore, we find that quotations are most accurate when they are long—the writers in such cases thinking it worth while to take down and copy what they wished to quote. But even in such cases we do not find, and we have no right to expect, such severely accurate quotations as are required in modern controversy. The resemblance which is required before we can establish a quotation is therefore a matter of degree; and opinions held by modern critics as to the exact degree on which we have a right to insist, vary with their preconceptions. It seems to me, however, that in the case of Clement we have no need to fall back upon general considerations. He quotes the Old Testament largely; and, as we have the Septuagint in our hands, we can see how he uses it. At a very early stage in the Epistle, he quotes Deut. xxxii. 15, when he says, "*ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον*," and yet, after this solemn appeal, we find that he has taken very considerable liberties with his original. In other cases he throws a number of passages together, and often so changes them all as to lead to a doubt

from how many he drew the materials so fused. Out of fifty-seven quotations from the Old Testament, only seventeen are exact; and some of the others are so widely variant as to make it doubtful whether even a treacherous memory could be the cause of the divergence.[1]

The following will show how Clement deals with the original in slightly divergent quotation, and will also illustrate his citations of a less accurate character:—

Clement, c. 52, 2.—*Φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δανίδ· Ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἀρέσει αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ μόσχον νέον κέρατα ἐκφέροντα καὶ ὁπλάς· ἰδέτωσαν πτωχοὶ καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν. Καὶ πάλιν λέγει· Θῦσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχάς σου· καὶ ἐπικάλεσαί με ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεώς σου, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαί σε, καὶ δοξάσεις με· θυσία γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον.*

Ps. lxix. 31.—*Αἰνέσω τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ μου μετ' ᾠδῆς, μεγαλυνῶ αὐτὸν ἐν αἰνέσει. Καὶ ἀρέσει τῷ Θεῷ ὑπὲρ μόσχον νέον κέρατα ἐκφέροντα καὶ ὁπλάς. Ἰδέτωσαν πτωχοὶ καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν.*

Ps. l. 14, quoted exactly; and Ps. li. 17 joined to it.

The following is of a very different character. It is startling in its extraordinary combination, if combination it be:—

Clement, c. 29, 4.—*Καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει· Ἰδοὺ Κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἅλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἁγίων.*

There is no such passage, but it may be supposed to be a blending of—

Num. xviii. 27.—*Καὶ λογισθήσεται ὑμῖν τὰ ἀφαιρέματα ὑμῶν ὡς σῖτος ἀπὸ ἅλω, καὶ ἀφαίρεμα ἀπὸ ληνοῦ.*

Deut. iv. 34.—*Εἰ ἐπείρασεν ὁ Θεὸς εἰσελθὼν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἔθνους ἐν πειρασμῷ, καὶ ἐν σημείοις, καὶ ἐν τέρασι, κ.τ.λ.*

2 Chron. xxxi. 14.—*Καὶ Κορὴ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεμνὰ ὁ Λευίτης ὁ πυλωρὸς κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἐπὶ τῶν δομάτων, δοῦναι τὰς ἀπαρχὰς Κυρίου, καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, κ.τ.λ.*

The following may be taken as a specimen of inaccurate quotation from memory:—

Clement, c. 3. 1, *τὸ γεγραμμένον.—Ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν, καὶ ἐπλατύνθη καὶ ἐπαχύνθη καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος.*

[1] I had prepared a full list of Clement's quotations from the Old Testament, with the view of sustaining the position here taken up, but ere these sheets were printed I found it had been already done by Dr Sanday—'Gospels in the Second Cent.,' p. 26.

Deut. xxxii. 15.—Καὶ ἔφαγεν Ἰακὼβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη, καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος, ἐλιπάνθη, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη.

The following is a case of expansion of his original. Some suppose his authority to have been an apocryphal or interpolated Ezekiel; but of the existence of such a book there is great doubt. See Lightfoot's "Note."

Clement, c. 8, 2.—Ζῶ γὰρ ἐγὼ, λέγει Κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὴν μετάνοιαν· προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθήν· Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν· εἶπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου· Ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφῆτε πρός με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ, ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.

Ezek. xxxiii. 11. — Ζῶ ἐγὼ, τάδε λέγει Κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς ὡς ἀποστρέψαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν.

Compare Ps. ciii. 10; Jer. iii. 19; Is. i. 18; Ezek. xviii. 30.

This, then, was Clement's way of quoting the Old Testament. He alters, he fuses; sometimes he quotes correctly; sometimes we are inclined to suppose an apocryphal book to have been in his mind.

Let us now turn to

Clement's relation to New Testament Passages.

The references under John's Gospel, p. 170, and notes, contain enough to show his mode of quotation of the words of Jesus.

The first one (on page 104) from c. 13 is perplexing. If it is not from one of the canonical Gospels, we know not whence it was taken. To assume (1) that it is necessarily from some other written source, and (2) that the source was the "Gospel of the Hebrews," or the "Preaching of Peter," or the "Gospel of the Nazarenes," is to invent machinery for disposing of the difficulty. And against the assumption of some well-known written source, other than our Gospels ('Sup. Rel.'), is the fact that the same part of the Sermon on the Mount is quoted by Polycarp with equal variations from our Gospels,[1] but not the same variations as here. It is not a more remarkable change of the original than those we have quoted from the Old Testament.

[1] See Introduction on Polycarp; and Polycarp's words in our text, p. 112, with note on Polycarp's use of his authority.

On the whole, we conclude with Lightfoot that, "as Clement's quotations are often very loose, we need not go beyond the canonical Gospels for the source of this passage."

The extract from c. 46 (p. 105) seems to be a quotation from memory. The passages combined are just such as would naturally be combined in memory, although they are far apart in the Gospels. Compare Mat. xxvi. 24, xviii. 6; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 1, 2. Tertullian tells us that Marcion's Gospel contained in the beginning of chap. xvii. of our St Luke the interpolation, "*Expedisse ei, si natus non fuisset*," &c., which may be an echo of this reading of Clement's, or a proof of a widespread traditional rendering.

The words (c. 44), "And our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there shall be strife on account of the overseership,"[1] is mainly remarkable because it is the precursor of many similar references in subsequent writers. Justin quotes as a saying of Jesus, "There shall be schisms and heresies."[2] The Clementine Homilies make it more explicit: "There shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, heresies, desires for supremacy."[3] And Hegesippus may refute them, when he says, "From these came the false Christs, false prophets, false apostles, who divided the unity of the Church."[4] Those who refer these passages to some current written Gospel, have to account for the extreme freedom of the variations: and it does not seem possible to do so without adopting the very principle on which they refuse to proceed, when they object to canonical books as the probable source of divergent quotations. (See text, p. 125, and note.)

There is a chapter (c. 24) on the Resurrection, which is full of phrases suggesting the New Testament. It is said that the Lord *τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τὸν Κύριον* Ἰν Χν *ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας*. We have also *ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων* (Mat. xiii. 3), and a doctrinal use of the fact that the seed from its death brings forth fruit (1 Cor. xv. 36; John xii. 24). And we have a solemn use of the words, *ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος* [Θεός], which Keim[5] admits to be an allusion to John.

To cite here, or even to give a classification of the innumerable phrases in Clement which suggest the New Testament, is beyond our limits. The principal passages in full, and references to many more, will be found in the text:[6] but no one can read the Epistle without seeing

[1] "Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰυ Χυ ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς."

[2] "Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις."

[3] "Ἔσονται γὰρ ὡς ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι."—Hom. xvi. 21.

[4] "Ἀπὸ τούτων ψευδόχριστοι, ψευδοπροφῆται, ψευδαπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἐμέρισαν τὴν ἕνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας."—Eus. H. E. IV. 22. At the same time the words of Hegesippus are as near to Mat. xxiv. 24.

[5] See Jes. v. Naz., i. 141.

[6] Special reference may be made to the numerous passages cited or referred to under Heb., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit., and 1 Pet.

that its author's mind is steeped in the thoughts, doctrines, and associations which are preserved to us in Scripture. It is entirely beyond the power of lists and figures to convey an idea of the strength of the witness for the perpetuity of the first characteristics of Christianity, which we find in the outpouring of the heart of this "ep-apostolic" teacher.[1] Only a perusal can give the impression,—but it is one which can never be forgotten. The incarnation of the pre-existent Christ, who had spoken before by the mouth of the Seers; and the blood by which we are saved; and the resurrection of the crucified Christ; and the spirit by which our life should be ruled,—of these truths the mind of Clement is full. He closes what we may term a prose poem in c. 49 with these words: "*In love the Lord* (ὁ δεσπότης) *took us towards Himself; for the love which He had towards us, Jesus Christ our Lord* (Κύριος), *according to the will of God, gave His blood on our account, and His flesh for our flesh, and His blood for our blood.*"

Justification by Faith with works,—as the enlightened Christian conscience has without formula set the doctrine clear before itself,—this is the teaching of Clement. We may hear St James and St Paul speak with blended voice, although the tone of James is more distinct, when Clement says (c. 30, 3): "*Let us therefore cleave to those to whom grace has been given from God; let us put on like-mindedness with them, being lowly of mind, self-restraining, putting ourselves far apart from all murmuring and evil speaking, being justified by works and not by words.*" Many of the phrases are Petrine also, so that we see in Clement the disciple of all the chief apostles.[2]

Or we may hear what seems to be Clement's own more personal thought, following perhaps the "blessed Paul" (c. 32, 4): "*All the saints of old were glorified and magnified, not through themselves, or their works, or their righteous deeds which they achieved, but through His will. And we therefore, being called by His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves, or through our wisdom, or prudence, or piety, or works which we did in purity of heart, but through the faith through which the Almighty God somehow justified all men from all ages: to whom be glory everlasting.*"

If we would see how Clement's grateful heart made the Personal Saviour the centre of his life, we only need to turn to c. 36. If we would see how he extends the application of Paul's praise of love, in words which remind us of the Lord Himself in John's Gospel, and of Peter as well, we find c. 49 full of meaning for us.[3]

[1] Donaldson, Apostolic Fathers, p. 101.

[2] Κολληθῶμεν—see Acts v. 13, viii. 26, &c., as illustrating the close companionship of the early Christians. Ταπεινοφρονοῦντες—see Acts xx. 19; Col. iii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 5. Ἐγκρατευόμενοι—see 1 Cor. ix. 25. Ψιθυρισμοῦ—see 2 Cor. xii. 20. Καταλαλιαί—see 2 Cor. xii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 1 (not a classical word). Πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες—comp. 1 Pet. ii. 1, ἀποθέμενοι, and James i. 21, 22. Ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι—see James ii. 24, ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται.

[3] Compare the first words, Ὁ ἔχων ἀγάπην ἐν Χριστῷ ποιησάτω τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ

It is quite true that this correspondence between Clement (the same applies to Polycarp) and the canonical writers, to which we here refer, is not one of quotations which can be weighed or counted with mathematical exactness; but it is not for all that to be lightly esteemed. If we had to construct the scheme of Christian Theology from those writers, we should certainly have considerable difficulty, because of the unstudied way in which they write, and also because of the vagueness of their ideas on doctrine. Their aim is mainly ethical. They are exhorting Christians to constancy in the faith; to brotherly kindness; to submission to lawful authority; they are teaching no doctrine save by implication; and theology and criticism find little to claim in their writings. But, on the other hand, they manifest in every page, and almost in every line, the power of a religion based upon the truths of our Gospel. The men have rested their faith upon Jesus Christ as their Saviour; they have done that once for all; and now they are occupied in living up to the requirements of Christianity in daily life. It is not that they have no knowledge of Christian truth as a system,—they founded upon St Paul's Epistles, and therefore must have had a theology,—but they are dealing with Christian life and practical religion. When regarded in this their true light, these Epistles of Clement and Polycarp furnish an argument for the canon, by implying far more than they express. They imply the previous acceptance of the existing documents and doctrines of the New Testament: and the very fact that in the case of those to whom they were writing, as in their own, they constantly assume that the religion of Jesus Christ has been known and believed, is a powerful testimony to the acceptance of the same facts, and the prevalence of the same truth. We may see that Clement knew his readers to be more familiar with the life of Jesus Christ than with the biographies of Old Testament saints; for when he speaks of Abraham or Moses or David, he thinks it necessary to remind them of the general characters of the life, whereas a simple allusion to the facts of the history of Jesus Christ is enough.

If the Tübingen theories as to the origin of Christianity, and to the manufacture of canonical books, were well founded, or even possibly correct, those writings of the "Apostolical Fathers" could not have been what they are. For at the very time when, according to Baur, Christianity was torn with an internal conflict between the factions of Peter and Paul; at the very time when the victorious Pauline party were manufacturing letters and histories in the name and in the supposed interests of the great Apostle of the Gentiles;—at that

παραγγέλματα, with John xiv. 15, and 1 John v. 1. Compare ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν with 1 Pet. iv. 8. Compare ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν with 1 John ii. 5 and 1 John iv. 18. The burden of the chapter, as a whole, is evidently taken from 1 Cor. xiii.

very time appeared those letters of Clement and Polycarp, showing in every unstudied line the general acceptance of the Gospel narratives, and of the Epistles now found in our New Testament.

Second Epistle.

A Homily of the second century falsely ascribed to Clement.

When all that we knew of the so-called "Second Epistle" was the fragment found in Cod. A, it was difficult to say anything very certain about it. But now that the whole has been found in Greek and in Syriac, there can be no doubt of the truth of what was (since Grabe) believed by many before, that it is not an Epistle, but a Homily. We read in Justin and Tertullian, and we may perhaps infer from Pliny, that after the reading of the Scriptures in the Christian congregations of the second century, it was usual for the President, or some one deputed by him, to exhort the people: and who has not longed for some specimen of the words which were spoken on such occasions—words that nourished the simple but strong faith of the early Church? What was longed for is now in our hands.[1] Whether the Homilist was a Presbyter, whose ordinary function was to teach, or some one speaking on some exceptional occasion, may be doubtful (see chapters 17 and 19)—is indeed disputed among eminent critics; but that it was an address of the usual character, only so acceptable as to be widely circulated and carefully preserved, we need not doubt at all.

Was it, then, the work of Clement? We can scarcely suppose that Clement, when speaking for himself, would have spoken as one who was accustomed to be exhorted by the Presbyters, yet this writer does so speak (c. 17). This alone makes us conclude against the theory that the Homily was Clement's. Other reasons have been advanced to the same effect, but they are of less moment. The theology of the Homily is said to be of later date than that of Clement's genuine Epistle; and the view of the New Testament is regarded as more advanced. But arguments on this basis are precarious; and they can be met by assertions on the other side, to the effect that we cannot fairly compare the theology of a sermon with that of a letter, and that the vagueness of the references to the New Testament Epistles, and the apparent absence of a Bishop in the Church, indicate an even earlier date than Clement's day.

All that we can say for certain is, that the Homily does not seem to be Clement's,[2] but is of old date, and was so highly valued as to be

[1] As in Clement's Epistle we have the oldest public prayer of the Christian Church, so in this Homily we have the oldest Christian sermon extant. See Jacobi, Stud. u. Kritiken, 1876 (4).

[2] Bryennios gallantly defends his thesis, that Clement is the author; but he has nothing save a partial tradition on his side.

bound up with the Epistle of Clement, though how it came to be ascribed to him as its author we can only conjecture. External evidence of its antiquity is not of much assistance to us. Eusebius[1] is the first to mention it: and his uncomplimentary remark is that, though it is ascribed to Clement, he has no assurance of its having been used in old times, and that it is by no means to be put on a level with the first Epistle. In the fifth century the pseudo-Justin calls it "Clement's to the Corinthians." The allusions in the sixth century are so uncertain as to make nothing clear, save the fact that it was not at that time universally accepted as Clement's.

But if not Clement's, whose was it? That we cannot say. Some indeed find in its references to Scripture the same point of view as in Barnabas; others think it is so like Hermas, as to be by the same author; others would persuade us that it is the work of Clement of Alexandria.[2] It is easy to conjecture, but apparently impossible to ascertain.

But if by an unknown author, where did he speak it? In Rome, in Corinth, or where? From its earliest known history, one is inclined to suppose that it was addressed (as Clement's letter was) to the Corinthian Church; and the allusions to the games go to favour the same conclusion. The Homilist not only speaks with evidently full knowledge of the proceedings in the contests, but his language implies that he was near the spot at which the "crowds land to take part in the games."[3] That he was a Gentile appears from his allusions to the past history of his "people" and his "church"—c. 1, 6; c. 2, 1, 3. We have probability on our side, when we say that it was spoken in Corinth, and therefore came eventually to be put alongside of Clement's Epistle to the church in that place.

What is the date of the Homily? In this as in other questions affecting the date of writings of the second century, we have to see what form of Gnosticism seems to have been in the author's view. Applying this test, we cannot fail to observe that he is a vigorous assailant of that phase of Gnosticism which denied the resurrection of the body,—or rather the resurrection of the flesh (*τῆς σαρκός*). The earliest Gnosticism took that form; the fundamental dogma of all Gnosticism, the sinfulness of matter, naturally produced it; we see it even in the Pauline Epistles; and we are led towards the conclusion, that the preacher spoke at no later date than the beginning of the second century. To the same effect is the consideration that he uses language which he would probably have avoided, had the speculations of Valentinus and Marcion been known to him. For these reasons, it

[1] H. E. III. 38.

[2] See Hilg. Proleg., p. xlix. Several of the quotations undoubtedly call Clement of Alexandria to mind. Dodwell first suggested this. The use of the Gospel of the Egyptians is common to both the Homilist and the great Christian Sophist.

[3] *Καταπλέουσιν*—see Lightf., pp. 197, 306.

is natural to fix some time between A.D. 120 and A.D. 140 as the date. But, on the other hand, we must remember that this was really a popular sermon, not a philosophical treatise, nor even a written Epistle; and that its author had evidently in view the practical end of warning men not to indulge in lusts which would defile the body that is destined to rise again. The greatness of the present life, because in it the Christian works out the great salvation which Christ purchased for him—that is the preacher's theme, as against those who held the Gnostic tenets of the incurable sinfulness of matter, and the immortality of mind alone. We may well hesitate to conclude that the preacher knew no subtler form of Gnosticism than that which he vigorously denounces. It was still specially needful, as before, in Corinth, to urge men to discipline the body, and to live according to the purity of the Gospel (see c. 4, 6; 7, 15); and we can easily believe that this pressing need filled the earnest teacher's mind, so that he would not dwell on the intricacies of speculations whose evil results were more indirect or more remote, even though such speculations might be known to him.

In short, although there is no reason to fix a date later than A.D. 120-140, there is not much in the views taken of Gnosticism to compel us to come to that, or any other very definite conclusion. The Homily might have been spoken a generation later, or even later still. The mode of quoting Scripture furnishes, in point of fact, the only valid argument for its being a work of the second century—and before the last years of that century. No representative of the Catholic Church in the end of the century would have stood in the same perplexing relation to the "Scriptures" and the "Gospel" and the "words of the Lord" as this preacher, who quoted indiscriminately the Old Testament and the New Testament and the Apocryphal books, the canonical Gospels and the lost Gospel of the Egyptians.

When we look at one side, the testimony to our Scriptures is explicit and ample. The author (c. 2) quotes Mat. ix. 13 as *γραφή*,—in this reminding us of Barnabas; and he uses the same word for the Old Testament (c. 6, 14). Words introduced (c. 8) with "Thus saith the Lord in the Gospel" seem to be a blending of Luke xvi. 10 with Mat. xxv. 21. "Thus saith the Lord" is his most usual formula for the New Testament (cc. 3, 4; 6, 9); and he uses it for the Old Testament also (cc. 13, 15). In one place (c. 14) he alludes in general terms to the Old and New Testament as *τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι*, saying that they are not the Church, because the Church is spiritual. The reading is doubtful, but it is to this effect.[1]

[1] Hilgenfeld inserts in c. 10 a passage bearing on the canon, in which the Old Testament and New Testament and the Sibyl are enumerated as Scriptures: *αἱ γραφαὶ προφητῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἔτι τε καὶ τῆς σιβύλλης.* His authority is found in some extracts bearing the name of John of Damascus (eighth century). But even this re-

Nor is this all. In one notable passage, after quoting the Old Testament as "Thus saith the Lord," he goes on to cite the words of Jesus Christ from the New Testament as "God saith" (c. 13). In another place he describes the reading of the Scriptures as hearing the God of Truth: indeed his words are even stronger, and must be quoted,—"Wherefore, brethren and sisters, after the God of Truth, I now read[1] you an exhortation to attend to the things which have been written, so that you may both save yourselves and him who readeth among you" (c. 19). In c. 13 he refers to λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, so as to show that he means either the very words or the substance of the Christian writings which Christians made known to the Gentiles. In this he may be regarded as illustrating the much-disputed words of Papias that Matthew wrote the λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eus. H. E. III. 39). If there be any ambiguity in the Homilist's words—if we cannot say without hesitation that he refers to the 'Evangelical Record' (Lightfoot), rather than to its substance—we may undoubtedly say that there is the same ambiguity as to substance and record in Rom. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12; and that, at all events, there is not good ground for believing (with many modern critics) that λόγια in the case of Papias meant a collection of Christ's sayings, as distinct from an account of His works.

So far all seems clear. But there is another side. The author (c. 4) quotes in some places as "The Lord said" words which we do not find in our Gospels (chaps. 4 and 5); and as he reports a dialogue between our Lord and some one which Clement of Alexandria ascribes to the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," it has been supposed that some of his other passages are taken from the same source. In another passage he refers to *the prophetic word* for a solemnly cited quotation, which seems to come from some Old Testament apocryphal book. The same passage with variations is quoted as γραφή in the Epistle of Clement (c. 23). In other cases he seems to re-echo the books of Tobit and Ecclesiasticus. There is no evidence that he knew the writings of John: the Pauline Epistles to the Ephesians and to Timothy are apparently quoted or echoed, but there is not any avowed founding upon New Testament Epistles as authorities.

On the whole, we conclude with some perplexity that the Homily was spoken at a period when a distinction between canonical and apocryphal writings was not sharply drawn as regards the New Testament; that the time for doctrinal inferences from the Pauline Epistles had not yet come; and that the use made of the Old Testament Apocrypha

cent authority is doubtful, and the origin of the extracts remains obscure. Some ascribe them to other pseudo-Clementine writings. Recent experience does not dispose us to deny the possibility of some gap in even our present form of the MS. But see Bryennios, Proleg. ρξα', and Hilg. Pat. Apost., p. 85.

[1] Bryennios emphatically notes that the speaker "read," and did not "deliver" his discourse (ἀνεγίνωσκεν οὐκ ἀπεστήθιξε).

and of the "Egyptian" Gospel, as well as the general cast of thought, warrant us in believing that, by education or by predilection, the unknown preacher was in some special way connected with the Christian Church in Alexandria.

The darkness in which the date, place, and authorship are involved, makes this ancient sermon more curious than valuable to the inquirer into Canonicity.

The chief references to the New Testament are:—

C. 1, 1. *κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.*—Acts x. 42.
2, 4. *ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.*—Mat. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17.
3, 2. *λέγει δὲ καὶ αὐτός· τὸν ὁμολογήσαντά με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου.*—Mat. x. 32 (free).
4, 2. *λέγει γάρ· οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, Κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην.*—Mat. vii. 21 (free).
6, 1. *λέγει δὲ ὁ Κύριος· οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν.*—Luke xvi. 13.
6, 2. *τί γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, ἐάν τις τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῇ;*—Mat. xvi. 26.
8, 5. *λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν.*—Luke xvi. 10; Mat. xxv. 21.
9, 5. *Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος, ὁ σώσας ἡμᾶς, ὢν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα, ἐγένετο σάρξ.*—John i. 14.
9, 11. *ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου.*—Mat. xii. 49.
11, 7. *ληψόμεθα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἃς οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.*—1 Cor. ii. 9, altered from LXX.
13, 3. *λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.*—Cf. Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12.
13, 4. *Ὅταν γὰρ ἀκούσωσι παρ' ἡμῶν ὅτι λέγει ὁ Θεός· οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς.*—Luke vi. 32-35 (free).
14, 2. (*ἐκκλησία ζῶσα*) *σῶμά ἐστι Χριστοῦ.*—Eph. i. 23, &c.
16, 4. *ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.*—1 Peter iv. 8.
18, 2. *διώκειν δικαιοσύνην.*—1 Tim. vi. 11, &c.
19, 2. *ἐσκοτισμένοι τὴν διανοίαν.*—Eph. iv. 18 (Clem. Ep. c. 36).
20, 5. *τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ ἀοράτῳ.*—1 Tim. i. 17.

The following may be regarded as echoes of the New Testament:—

C. 1, 5. *ἀντιμισθίας*, and also c. 15, 2.—Rom. i. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 13.
2, 8. *ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας.*—Rom. iv. 17; 1 Cor. i. 29.
1. also 2. *ἀπολλυμένους ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν.*
6, 9. *παράκλητος.*—Luke xix. 10, &c.
8, 6. *τηρεῖν ἄσπιλον.*—1 Tim. vi. 14; James i. 27—here referring to baptism as *σφραγίς*. In c. 6, 9 it is *τηρεῖν τὸ βάπτισμα ἁγνὸν καὶ ἀμίαντον*—see also c. 7, 6. Compare 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. iv. 30; Rev. ix. 4, for the New Testament meaning of the seal and covenant.
14, 3. *φθείρῃ*, as in 1 Cor. iii. 17.
15, 1. *ἑαυτὸν σώσει κἀμὲ τὸν συμβουλεύσαντα.*—1 Tim. iv. 16. See also c. 19.
μισθὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι μικρὸς πλανωμένην ψυχὴν καὶ ἀπολλυμένην ἀποστρέψαι εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι.—James v. 20.
19, 1. *σκοπόν*, as in Phil. iii. 14.

Other Epistles ascribed to Clement.

Two Epistles on Virginity were published by Wetstein from the Syriac (in which alone they exist) as an Appendix to his Greek Testament, 1752. They quote from the New Testament as found in the Syrian Canon: and they are themselves bound up with 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude, in an Appendix to the Syriac New Testament. They seem to have been known to Epiphanius and Jerome, and were probably written originally in Greek by some one connected with the Eastern Church. Westcott assigns them to the middle of the second century. All the books of the Peshito New Testament are quoted (save Mark and Philemon, probably omitted by accident)—see Westcott, Canon, p. 167; Lightfoot, Corinthians, p. 18. These two Epistles were regarded by the Syrian Church as genuine works of Clement.

Epistle to James the Lord's Brother, found prefixed to the Clementine Homilies.[1] It claims to give a narrative of Clement's appointment by Peter to be Bishop of Rome; and to furnish also the Apostle's injunctions as to Church government. It is found in an enlarged form among the forged Papal Decretals. It may also date in its Greek form from the second century; and its Latin version (Rufinus) is of the fourth.

A Second Epistle to James. It is a forgery of much later date—probably of the fifth century. It refers to ritualistic minutiæ, church furniture, and such like. It is mentioned here because the Western Church, which lost all traces of the genuine Epistles of Clement, and

[1] See Antenicene Library, vol. xvii.

of the venerable Homily, seems to have regarded the two Epistles to James as the genuine Epistles of Clement.

There were many other forgeries in Clement's name during the subsequent centuries—see Lightfoot, Clement, p. 21.

III.—HERMAS.

This book bears but slightly upon our inquiry regarding the canon. It is the work of the Bunyan of the Church of the second century. It is a succession of visions and mystic teachings, called "The Shepherd," because the author describes the angel who instructed him as "a man of glorious aspect, dressed like a shepherd, with a white skin, a wallet on his shoulders, and a staff in his hand."[1] It is full of practical teaching, and contains not a few passages which may be styled beautiful; but it is not an interesting book. It is a distinctively Christian, perhaps Judæo-Christian, book, and is evidently written for those who, knowing the doctrines of the Gospel, needed to have its pure moral requirements impressed on them. One can believe that it served somewhat of the same purpose in its day as the miracle-plays and the sacred allegories of the Reformation period did afterwards, or as the Ober-Ammergau festival does in our own day. But for those who seek unequivocal traces, not of Christianity only, but of the use of our canonical books, or of other Christian books regarded as Scripture, there is little in the Shepherd of Hermas. Through its theology one may come to certain conclusions, but it is not our present purpose to follow that path. It shows us a clear faith in the living God and in the suffering and exalted Saviour, and we might show from it the continuity of Christian doctrine. There are difficulties, however, even in the theology. Whether Hermas clearly distinguished between Christ and the Holy Ghost (Sim. IX. 1), or what he meant in every case by the words "Son of God" as descriptive of Christ, we cannot here inquire.[2] It is enough for us to say that there is only one quotation from the New Testament that can be identified (Vis. II. 2; Mat. x. 33), and one distinct allusion (Vis. II. 3) to an apocryphal book, when he says that Heldad and Modad prophesied to the people in the wilderness.[3]

[1] Vision V.

[2] For the theology of Hermas see Donaldson, "Apostolical Fathers" (1874). See 2 Clem. c. 14, 4, 5, for identification of Christ and the Spirit.

[3] The names are in Num. xi. 26, &c. The Apocryphal book is named in the "Synopsis of Athanasius."

There are many passages which may fairly be taken as "echoes" of words and thoughts of the New Testament. Especially are we reminded of James, and of Peter, and of the Apocalypse, though the works of Paul are also frequently suggested.

The "Shepherd" was highly thought of in the early Church, both in east and west. There seems no good reason to doubt the statement[1] that it was written by Hermas while its author's brother was Bishop of Rome, so that it dates from about A.D. 142. That it belongs to the ep-apostolic age in any closer way is most improbable.[2] But there is no doubt that if we have given the right date it attained to great popularity very soon, for Irenæus seems to quote it (though he does not name it) with marked approval,—καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν ἡ γραφή. Clement of Alexandria speaks of it as divinely spoken, and by revelation: and Origen says, "I think it divinely inspired." Tertullian, on the other hand (after he became a Montanist), not only denounced it as the book that "loves adulterers," but says that even the synods of the orthodox counted it spurious. His objection was that it allowed a fallen Christian to be restored. It cannot have been an old book in his time. (See Westcott, Canon, p. 179, for proofs of its being of the age when Montanism began.) Eusebius sets it among the disputed or the spurious books. (See H. E. III. 3, III. 25, and V. 8.)

The recent discovery of a part of Hermas in the Sinaitic codex has so far furnished scholars with Hermas in Greek; from which, and from the Leipsic codex, and the various Latin versions, Hilgenfeld (1866) and Gebhardt and Harnack (1877) have set themselves to construct the Greek in full.[3] There is also an Æthiopic version (published 1860), with a modern Latin rendering, of which use has been

[1] *Muratorian Canon.* Hilgenfeld suggests that one so nearly connected with the superintendents of the Church would not have rated them so soundly as ignorant and emulous of each other (see Vis. III. 9, &c.; Hilgenf., Pat. Apost., Proleg. Hermas, p. 15). It may also be doubted whether the author does not seem to be an uneducated man, of hazy theology and imperfect powers of expression. But still the statement of the Muratorian fragment may be adhered to.

[2] It is hopeless to connect it with the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14, although Origen thinks it possible. It speaks of the death of the Apostles as past; and it speaks of Christians as tried by law, and judicially condemned to the wild beasts. Judicial proceedings were subsequent to Trajan's rescript, and possibly we may find in this way that its earliest date is Hadrian's reign (beginning A.D. 138). We thus confirm the Muratorian date.

[3] See Hilgenfeld, Proleg., p. 1, and Donaldson, Apost. Fathers, p. 383, &c., for full accounts of the forgery of a Greek version of part of the book by Simonides, and the suspicions entertained of his work, and even of Tischendorf's. This last reference Westcott (Canon, p. 190) does not meet. (See Reuss, Gesch., s. 275.) Geb. and Har. (Hermas, Proleg., 1877) point out the difficulties in the way of supposing the Greek of Hermas (as we have it) to be a translation from the Latin. If Hermas wrote in Greek, then the Greek and the Latin version of it have been lost; if he wrote in Latin, the original Latin and the first Greek of it have been lost: and to add to the perplexity, the Greek which we have is not a rendering of either or both of the Latin versions which we have (the very corrupt common Latin, and the Palatine MS, which differs from the common one).

made; and there are numerous quotations in Greek critics, especially Clem. Alex., pseudo-Athanasius, and Antiochus, a monk of the seventh century. But the origin of the Greek of Hermas is still a problem only partially solved.

IV.—IGNATIUS.

There is great difficulty in making any use of the Ignatian testimony to the canonical books, because it is very uncertain how much Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, actually wrote of what bears his name. If we could assume that the early traditions of his death, in the time of Trajan, A.D. 115, are true, his testimony would be specially valuable. He was, in that case, not only the contemporary of the post-apostolic Fathers, but was probably alive during, or soon after, Christ's life on earth.[1]

But the fifteen epistles ascribed to him have been, and still are, the subject of infinite debate. Eight of them[2] are now universally admitted to be spurious, as they are full of anachronisms, and of divergence from the quotations during the first five centuries, and were not only unknown to Eusebius, but, so far as can be seen, to all other Greek writers up to the sixth century. But even when those are removed from the field, disputes arise as to the seven which remain. There are seven enumerated by Eusebius,[3] and the notes and references which he gives correspond with seven which are preserved in Greek, Latin, and Armenian. But, first of all, we have two Greek recensions of them—a longer and a shorter—one of which must, of course, be spurious. The form in which they were known to exist when Calvin and others rightly denounced them as spurious was what is now usually called the longer recension. Voss published six of the shorter form in Greek (1646),

[1] A tradition of uncertain origin describes him as the child whom Jesus took in His arms (Mat. xviii. 3). But this seems to have arisen from mistaking Θεοφόρος, the title which he gives himself, with Θεόφορος (carried by God). In the Martyr. Ign. Colb., c. 2, it is said to mean ὁ Χριστὸν ἔχων ἐν στέρνοις.

[2] One to the Virgin Mary; two to the Apostle John (these are only in Latin); one to Mary of Cassobolac; one each to Tarsians, Antiochians, Hero of Antioch, Philippians. There are also one or two letters to Ignatius in the full pseudo-Ignatian collection.

[3] The seven are addressed to Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans, Polycarp. Eusebius (H. E. III. 36) tells us about them, saying that Ignatius wrote the first-named three from Smyrna, where Polycarp was; and not only gives several references which are found in the letters we have, but quotes a long passage in which Ignatius entreats the Romans not to prevent him from winning the crown of martyrdom. He adds similarly that the others were written from Smyrna.

and the seventh (to the Romans) was published afterwards by Ruinart in 1689. All agree that the discovery of the shorter recension (in Latin, by Usher, 1644; and in Greek, by Voss, 1646) gives a final blow to claims to genuineness by the longer epistles. But while all agree that the shorter letters—called by Lightfoot the *Vossian*[1]—are better than the longer, there remains the question whether the smaller themselves are genuine. Lardner says of it, "Whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question." At the same time, critics agreed with him that it is "probable that they are in the main the genuine epistles of Ignatius."

So stood the controversy when Dr Cureton found among the treasures brought from Nitria, and published (in 1845), "The Ancient Syriac version of the Epistles of St Ignatius to St Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans," and argued that those three are all the extant genuine works of Ignatius. In this Syriac recension not only is the number of epistles smaller, but each epistle itself is shorter, more rugged, and more abrupt. The upholders of the "*Curetonian* Epistles" think the Greek form an expansion and corruption of the lost Greek originals of those Syriac letters. Its opponents think the Syriac a capricious or a devotional abridgment of the Greek.

In 1849 Petermann published an *Armenian* version of the Ignatian Epistles, corresponding, so far as the three letters go, with the Syriac, but containing all the seven Vossian epistles. It contains thirteen in all—that is to say, six in addition to the Vossian. He argues that this Armenian version was made from a Syriac version in the fifth century. If this be true, then both a Greek and a Syriac version of more than the seven epistles must have existed at a very early date.

Such, and so complicated, is the question of the Ignatian letters. The latest theory, to which many critics[2] have declared their adherence, is that the seven letters which we now have are those that were known and accurately described by Eusebius, that they were translated into Syriac soon after his time, and that the Curetonian epistles are merely an extract from them. It is further supposed that they were interpolated by the pseudo-Ignatius about the period A.D. 360-380, and that this is the origin of the longer recension.

[1] Strictly speaking, as stated in the text, Voss had only the Greek of six; the seventh (Romans) was published by Ruinart. This epistle, probably because addressed to a distant European church, is not found in the oldest MSS alongside of the other six, which seem to have been collected in Asia at an early date. Polycarp tells the Philippians, c. 13, that he has collected and sends all the Ignatian letters he can find, and that they are full of faith and patience and all Christian edification. The Roman one was not at hand—there was not time for it to have come back; and we owe its preservation to its being imbedded in a martyrology.

[2] Zahn claims that he has won for his views the approval of Hilgenfeld, Lipsius, Overbeck, Delitzsch, and others. See Pat. Apost. op. (Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn), vol. ii. p. 6. He has certainly found a powerful ally in Lightfoot.

Notwithstanding the apparent agreement of critics in thinking at least the Curetonian letters genuine (because the quotations of the second and third centuries are found in them), and the Vossian epistles not later than the middle of the second century, mainly because of the writer's absolute silence on the controversies which distracted the Church at a later date, we venture still to think that all the difficulties are by no means solved.

The story on which the epistles rested, though not beyond doubt,[1] is probably true. It seems to be a fact that Ignatius professed himself to be a Christian while Trajan was in Antioch (A.D. 116[2]), and was sent to Rome to the wild beasts. It is probably true that Ignatius wrote various letters while upon this journey,—the earliest testimony (Polycarp, Theophilus, Irenæus, Origen, Lucian, Eusebius) is quite enough to establish that fact; but the point upon which we are not sure is the survival of those letters to our day in such a form that they can be used as evidence of anything else. Polycarp in his epistle refers to the letters; Irenæus and Origen quote them explicitly; but when we use any passage, we are in doubt whether it has not been manipulated. It is in the matter of quotation from Scripture that the longer forms differ most from each other. The Curetonian text contains no quotation from the Old Testament, and very few from the New. The Vossian contains a number of quotations, the longer Greek form very many. Which is the genuine form of these letters? I cannot

[1] The authorities before Eusebius for the Ignatian authorship of the letters are four in number. Polycarp (Phil. c. 13, 9, i. 1) refers to Ignatius's letter to the Philippians. Irenæus (B. V. 28, 3) refers to Ign. ad Rom. c. 4, 2, in this way: *ὡς εἴπέ, τις τῶν ἡμετέρων διὰ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν μαρτυρίαν κατακριθεὶς πρὸς θηρία.* Origen (Prolog. to Canticles) cites Ign. ad Rom. c. 7, 2: *Denique memini aliquem sanctorum dixisse, Ignatium nomine, de Christo.* And in his sixth Hom. in Luc. he says: *Καλῶς ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μάρτυρός τινος ἐπιστολῶν γέγραπται—τὸν Ἰγνάτιον λέγω, τὸν μετὰ τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον τῆς Ἀντιοχείας δεύτερον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ θηρίοις μαχησάμενον.* When Eusebius takes up the subject, he (H. E. III. 36) refers to the testimonies of Polycarp and Irenæus. He refers to the tradition which speaks of Ignatius as sent from Syria to Rome, to be the prey of wild beasts, with his *λόγος δ' ἔχει*—a phrase that seems, in his usage, to distinguish tradition from clearly historical authority. In his Chronicle (after II. 23 Abr.). Eusebius mentions Ignatius as martyr and second bishop of Antioch; and again he seems to speak of him as second bishop of Antioch. But the lists of bishops are confused; and Eusebius seems, in his Chronicle, to depend on Julius Africanus (A.D. 222), who makes Euodius the first bishop of Antioch, and Ignatius the second, without counting Peter. Origen's notice, therefore, contradicts this; and Polycarp and Irenæus are too vague to be much depended upon for the details of the Ignatian story. Founding on the above facts, Harnack (Die Zeit des Ignatius, 1878) concludes that the tradition of Ignatius suffering martyrdom under Trajan is a bare possibility, without certainty, without even special probability (p. 71). The ingenious argument of Harnack, however, fails to account for the references in Polycarp, Irenæus, and Origen. They were founded on some fuller narratives—not on mere chronicles; and though we have not the details known to them, we must be prepared to allow for their existence.

[2] Wieseler (Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren, s. 126) still maintains that A.D. 107 is the date. But he founds on Eus. Chron., which Eusebius himself does not adhere to.

help thinking that all of them suggest suspicions; that even in the shortest form they contain anachronisms and high prelatical views foreign to the spirit of the New Testament, and characteristic of a system of Church government which there had not been time to develop since the last Epistles of St Paul were written. We read in Polycarp of presbyters and deacons only; Clement speaks of bishops or overseers and deacons: but we are in another atmosphere when we read those "Letters of Ignatius," who was not later than they. Take, for example, the letter to Polycarp, as it is even in the Syriac version. It seems to me so unnatural a letter to be addressed to the great saint and bishop of Smyrna, that it would need very cogent external evidence for its genuineness before being accepted. Speaking of a man who can remain unmarried, he says (c. 5): "If he boasts, he is undone; if he become known apart from the bishop,[1] he has destroyed himself." After a few more words, he says, addressing not the bishop but the Church (c. 6): "Look ye to the bishop, that God also may look upon you. May I be instead of the souls of those who are subject to the bishops, presbyters, deacons; and may it be granted to me to have my lot with them in God." The whole tone of this letter is unlike Paul's in addressing his young friends Timothy and Titus; and it seems inconceivable that Ignatius could have spoken so much *de haut en bas* in addressing Polycarp. The Epistle to the Ephesians is full of similar expressions: they are to "receive the bishop as Him that sent him" (c. 6).[2] The Epistle to the Romans is not in the same tone.

It is possible that one's opinions on the general subject of the origin of Episcopacy may warp his critical judgment. I can only say that I have striven to divest myself of prejudice, and that after I have made every effort at being dispassionate, those letters still seem to me to have been either written or interpolated by one who was eager to extend an episcopal system already in existence, and that they therefore represent a much later date than the first or second decade of the second century.[3] The strongest argument on the other side is, that the tremulous eagerness of the writer to confirm the authority of the bishop indicates consciousness that he was far ahead of his readers in his hierarchical views. But this does not prevail to establish an early date, and is quite consistent with a late one.

[1] In the Vossian form it is: "If he be better known than the bishop, he is ruined" —"*ἐὰν γνωσθῇ πλέον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἔφθαρται.*"

[2] In Smyrn. c. 8, is the first use of the phrase *ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*, which is said to be "wherever Christ Jesus is." See Eus. H. E. IV. 7; Martyr. Pol. 8, &c.

[3] See Dressel's arguments (Proleg., p. xxvii), which remain in force, after all that Zahn (in his Ignatius von Antiochien, 1873; and in Gebhardt and Harnack's Pat. Ap.) and Lightfoot (in the Cont. Rev., 1875) have said.

Epistle to the Ephesians.

Quotations.

C. 8, 2. 1 Cor. ii. 14—The fleshly cannot do spiritual things. (Perhaps an echo.)
10, 1. 1 Tim. ii. 1 — Pray without ceasing. See also Ign. ad Polyc. c. 1. 3.
11, 1. Mat. iii. 7 — The wrath to come; 1 John ii. 18—"Last times."
14, 2. Mat. xii. 33—The tree known by its fruit.
15, 3. Apocalypse, xxi. 3—God in the midst of us. See also 2 Cor. vi. 16—(We are God's temples).
16, 1. 1 Cor. vi. 9—Shall not inherit the kingdom of God.
17, 1. Mat. xxvi. 7 — Spikenard on the Lord's head.
18, 1. 1 Cor. i. 20—The cross a stumbling-block, &c.; Where is the wise man, &c.
18, 2. Rom. i. 3, 4—Christ's descent from David, &c.

Echoes.

C. 1. Eph. v. 2—Offering, &c. salutation; Rom. xv. 29; Eph. iv. 13. (Pleroma, *πλήρωμα.*)
2. Col. i. 7—Refresh; 2 Tim. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 10—unity of mind.
4, 2. 1 Cor. vi. 15; Eph. v. 30 — Members of Christ.
5. Mat. xviii. 16; Acts iii. 20.
7, 2. John xvii. 3—Christ the true life. (See also c. 11, 1.) Eph. iv. 3—one calling, &c.
8, 1. 1 Cor. iv. 13—Offscouring. See also c. i. 1.
9. Eph. ii. 22—Stones of the temple; 1 Pet. ii. 3.
14, 1. Rev. i. 8 and xxi. 6; 2 Pet. i. 5, 7—"Faith and love the beginning and the end of life — Faith the beginning, love the end."
15, 3. Heb. iv. 13—All things known to God.
19, 2. Mat. ii. 1—The star.
20, 1. 1 Tim. i. 5, &c.—The stewardship.
21, 2. 1 Tim. i. 1—Christ our hope.
16. Heb. x. 28—How much more? Mark ix. 43.

Epistle to the Magnesians.

Quotations.

C. 5, 1. Acts i. 25—"His own place."
8, 2. John viii. 29—Who pleased in all things Him that sent Him.
10, 2. Put away the old leaven. *Ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην* (in 1 Cor. v. 7—*ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην*, &c.)

Echoes.

C. 6, 1. John i. 2 — Christ with the Father. See also 1 Peter, &c.
6, 2. Titus ii. 7—Type.
7, 1. John v. 19, &c.—Christ "did nothing without the Father."
7, 2. John xvi. 28—Christ proceeding from the Father.
8, 1. 1 Tim. i. 4; Gal. v. 4—Judaism; Titus i. 14; iii. 9; Heb. xiii. 9—divergence into useless controversies.
9, 1. Col. ii. 16, 17 — Not sabbatising, but keeping the Lord's day.
14, 1. Rom. xv. 14—"Ye are full of goodness."

Epistle to the Trallians.

Quotations.

C. 11, 1. Mat. xv. 13—A plant of the Father. See also Philadelphians, c. 3, 1.

Echoes.

C. 1, 3. 1 Pet. v. 5—Subject to one another.
3, 3. 2 Cor. xii. 6—I spare.
8, 2. 1 Tim. v. 14—"Giving no occasion to the Gentiles."
12, 3. 1 Cor. ix. 27—Lest I be unapproved, cast-away.
3. *κατάστημα*, Titus ii. 3.

Epistle to the Romans.

Quotations.

C. 5, 1. 1 Cor. iv. 4—Not thereby justified.
7, 2. John iv. 14; vii. 38 — Living water within.
7, 1. Prince of this world. See John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.
9, 2. 1 Cor. vii. 25; xv. 8.

Echoes.

C. 2, 2. Phil. ii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 6 — Libation.
4, 3. 1 Cor. vii. 22; ix. 1—The servant Christ's freedman.
5, 1. 1 Cor. xv. 32—Fight with wild beasts.
6, 1. Mat. xvi. 26—Better to die to Christ than to rule over the ends of the earth.
6. Phil. i. 21—Christ the gain.

Epistle to the Philadelphians.

Quotations.

C. 2, 1. Eph. v. 8; John xii. 26; 1 Thess. v. 5—Children of the light.
3, 3. 1 Cor. vi. 9—Inherit the kingdom of God.
7, 1. John iii. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 25 — The hidden work of the Spirit.
7, 2. Phil. ii. 3 — Nothing through strife.
8, 2. The Gospel the standard. See Phil. c. 2, 3.
9, 1. John x. 7—Christ the door of the Father.

Echoes.

C. 1, 1. Gal. i. 1—Not of men, &c.
5, 1. Prophets, Gospel Apostles. Also s. 2—The Gospel of our common hope.
9, 1. Gal. ii. 7 — Christ intrusted with the Holy of Holies.
6. Mat. xxiii. 27—Tombs.
11. Rom. iv. 7 — Receive one another.

Epistle to the Smyrnæans.

Quotations.

C. 1, 1. See also Ign. ad Eph. c. 18, 20; Rom. i. 4—Christ of the seed of David according to the flesh.
Mat. iii. 15—Baptised of John that all righteousness might be fulfilled.
6, 1. Mat. xix. 12. See Trall. c. 11, 2.

Echoes.

C. 4, 1. John xvii. 3, &c. — Christ the true light.
13, 1. 1 Tim. v; iii. 11 — Virgins called widows.
3. Acts x. 41.
10. 3 John, vv. 6, 8—Receiving believers.

Epistle to Polycarp.

Quotations.

C. 1. 1 Thess. v. 17 — Pray, &c. See Eph.
1, 3. Mat. viii. 17 — Ignatius here quotes Isaiah through St Matthew.
2, 2. Mat. x. 16.

Echoes.

C. 4. 1 Tim. v. 3; vi. 1; James ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 16.
5. Eph. v. 25 — Husbands love wives.
6, 2. Eph. vi. 11—Armour of God; 1 Thess. v. 8.
6. 2 Tim. ii. 4—Please Him.
7, 1. Eph.

Note.—In the Martyr. Ign. Colb., if it be genuine, are one or two valuable references. (Imbedded in this we find Ign. ad Rom.)

C. 2. Εἷς γὰρ ἔστιν θεὸς, ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἷς Ις Χς, ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ μονογενὴς—Rom. ix. 5; 1 John iv. 9.
2. Γέγραπται γὰρ· Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω—2 Cor. vi. 16.

EPISCOPACY.

Ephesians.

C. 2, 2. Obedience to the bishop and presbytery a means of complete sanctification.
3, 2. Territorial bishoprics.
5, 2. Great power of bishops' prayers.
5, 3. Joined to the bishop, as the Church is to Jesus Christ, and as He is to the Father. To be subject to the bishop, that they may be subject to God.
6, 1. Look to the bishop as to the Lord Himself.

To the Magnesians.

C. 4, 6. The bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the Sanhedrim of the apostles and the deacons.
13, 2. Obey the bishops and others as Christ His father according to the flesh, and the apostles obeyed Christ and the Father and the Spirit, that the unity may be both in the flesh and in the Spirit.

Trallians.

C. 2, 2. Do nothing without the bishop; be obedient also to the presbytery, as to the apostles of Jesus Christ. See also c. 3, 1.
7. He that does anything apart from the bishop and the presbytery and the deacon, this man is not pure in his conscience. See whole chapter, and also c. 12.

Smyrnæans.

C. 8, 1. Follow the bishop as Christ followed the Father, &c.
8, 2. Wherever the bishop appear, there let the multitude be; likeas wherever Jesus Christ may be, there is the Catholic Church. It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptise or to celebrate the love-feast; but whatever he may resolve, that also is well pleasing to God, that whatever is done may be secure and valid.

IGNATIUS'S QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Verbatim.	*Closely corresponding.*	*Variant.*
Magnesians, c. 12; Prov. xviii. 17.	Eph. c. 5; Prov. iii. 34 —Θεὸς κύριος. Eph. c. 15, 1; Ps. xxxiii. 9. Magnesians, c. 13, 1; Ps. i. 3. Smyrnæans, c. 1, 2; Is. v. 26.	Trallians, c. 8, 2; Is. lii. 5. (See Rom. ii. 24 for almost exact quotation. Ignatius changes the statement by prefixing οὐαί.)

V.—POLYCARP.

AN inquiry into the testimony of Polycarp need not range over a wide field. Many works have been ascribed to him, but there is not now any controversy regarding any of them save his letter to the Philippians. There is also a venerable monument of antiquity of which Eusebius has embodied a large portion in his narrative, and which is likewise found by itself under the title of the 'Martyrdom of Polycarp.' There can be no doubt of its great age, and of its containing some touching details of the aged martyr's fidelity to his faith. But it is burdened with some miracles useless save for purposes of display; its anxiety about the date indicates a recent martyrologist; and it professes to relate scenes in the Roman theatre which a Christian can with difficulty be supposed to have seen.[1] If we take it as it stands, it must be regarded as the compilation of some pious and credulous chronicler of an age later than the Martyr. But recent investigation tends to separate the original document from the accretions,[2] and to give fair grounds for accepting it as of the age of Polycarp.

But the Epistle which comes to us as Polycarp's own is of more importance. Who was Polycarp? The testimony of the early Christian Church to his special position is clear, copious, and authentic. Irenæus, in a touching letter to a friend of his own youth, shows how high was Polycarp's social position, and how honoured he was because of his

[1] See an exhaustive and convincing discussion in Donaldson's Apostolical Fathers (1874), p. 198, &c.

[2] See Zahn, Pat. Apost., Proleg., p. xlix, &c. The famous dove (περιστερά) flying from the wound in Polycarp's body is supposed by Wordsworth to have been a clerical error for περὶ στύρακα, descriptive of the blood flowing. Wieseler, however, throws doubt on the possibility of regarding στύραξ as the handle of a ξίφος, and supposes the words περιστερὰ καί to be an interpolation. Eusebius has omitted them.

having in his earlier days heard the truth from John and others who had seen the Lord, and how entirely his reminiscences harmonised with the written records [1] of the Lord's miracles and teaching.[2]

From Irenæus (B. III. 3), also, we have a formal and deliberate testimony to the position of his old teacher, which we must quote in full.[3]

"And Polycarp, who was not only instructed by Apostles, and had intercourse with many who had seen Christ, but was also appointed for Asia by Apostles in the church that is in Smyrna, an overseer, whom also we have seen in the beginning of our life, for he remained a long time, and at an exceedingly old age, having borne his testimony gloriously and most notably, departed this life, always taught these things, which also he learned from the Apostles, which also he gave to the Church, and which alone are true. To these doctrines testimony is also borne by all the churches throughout Asia, and by those who have been up till this time the successors of Polycarp, who was a much more trustworthy and secure witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion and the rest, who held wicked opinions. He [Polycarp] also sojourned at Rome in the time of Anicetus, converted many from the previously mentioned heretics to the Church of God, having proclaimed that he had received from the Apostles this as the one and only truth which he had delivered to the Church. And there are those who heard him say that John, the disciple of the Lord, having gone to bathe in Ephesus, on seeing Cerinthus inside, leaped from the bathing establishment without bathing, and exclaimed, 'Let us flee, lest the baths fall in, since Cerinthus, the enemy of truth, is within.' And Polycarp himself, when Marcion one time met him and said, 'Do you recognise us?' answered, 'I recognise the firstborn of Satan.' Such was the caution which the Apostles and their disciples took not to have even verbal communication with those who perverted the truth: as Paul also said, 'A heretical man avoid after a first and second admonition, knowing that such an one has been turned away, and sins, being self-condemned."

In still another passage (Eus. H. E. V. 24), Irenæus gives some further particulars of Polycarp's sojourn at Rome in the time of Anicetus,—showing that he was recognised as a representative of the followers of the Apostle John. The passage itself falls to be considered in another connection as bearing on what has become known as the "Paschal Controversy" (see text, p. 192). But for our present purposes it is enough to use this passage of Irenæus, and the references in Eusebius, as attesting that Polycarp was the disciple of the Apostle John.

So much for the personality of the author. When did he live and die? As a pupil of John and other eye-witnesses, he must have been old enough before the end of the first century to appreciate the teachings of the Apostles;[4] and as he died at the stake about the middle of

[1] "'Απήγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς."

[2] Irenæus's letter to Florinus: see Eus. H. E. V. 20.

[3] The translation is Dr Donaldson's,—Apostolical Fathers, p. 192.

[4] If we accept the tradition that just before his death he declared he had served Christ eighty and six years, and admit (see below) that he was killed in A.D. 155, the date of his birth is A.D. 69. If John lived till the time of Trajan, Polycarp was about thirty years old when the aged Apostle died.

the second century,[1] he is the most important living link between the writers whose works are the foundation of Christianity, and those others, such as Irenæus, whose works are the beginning of undoubted Christian treatises on the canonical Scriptures. There is some doubt as to the exact date of his death, contending critics upholding various years between A.D. 140 and 168. The date most recently maintained is A.D. 155; but, as our footnote shows, its acceptance leaves us at issue with some ancient authorities. There is not much difficulty in ascribing to the Epistle a date some time near the middle of the second century.

In regard to the letter itself. Its importance has led to its being very minutely scrutinised. Most of it exists in Greek; but part is only in an old Latin version, and where we have both they do not always correspond. This at the very outset awakens some suspicion, and in this fact the most important objections to the letter have their root. There is one objection founded on an alleged contradiction. In chap. 9 the writer speaks of the patience which the Philippians have seen before their eyes "in the blessed Ignatius, and Zosimus, and Rufus, and others,"[2] those martyrs being evidently dead. But in chap. 13 he asks (according to the Latin) for some tidings of Ignatius and those who are with him—Ignatius being thus referred to as still alive.[3]

[1] Contending critics have had new ground opened for them in the researches of M. Waddington. In his "Mémoire sur la Chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Ælius Aristide" (Mem. of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Jan. 27, year 1867), he set himself to establish that the date of Polycarp's martyrdom was February 155. It is impossible to exaggerate the respect with which every one must regard the careful and exhaustive summary of valuable details—from literature, coins, and imperial edicts—which is presented in this memoir. In his 'Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques' (1872), M. Waddington presents fuller details most methodically arranged (see on Quadratus, p. 220). The result is as already stated, and the majority of critics accept it. The strong point of a general kind is that on the ordinary date, A.D. 166, it is not possible to give Polycarp a mature age while the Apostle John lived. "Eighty and six years have I served Christ," were Polycarp's words; and whether we begin to reckon from his birth or his baptism, we have him a very young man in the year A.D. 100, about which time John died. Another point is that Quadratus governed Asia A.D. 154, 155; and that in his time (if we are to take the letter of the church of Smyrna as an authority) Polycarp suffered. The greater number of scholars have followed Waddington very closely (Lipsius, Echhardt, and Hilgenfeld differing only by a year, and saying A.D. 156), and thus discard Eusebius, Jerome, and the Paschal Chronicle, which agree in fixing the martyrdom after the accession of M. Aurelius (A.D. 161),—Eusebius making the date A.D. 166, and Jerome A.D. 167. The day of the week and the day of the month in the Julian year coincided every eleven years (Wieseler), and many of the marks of time would suit either A.D. 155 or A.D. 166. Wieseler (Die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren) defends the date of Eusebius. He founds upon the common consent of antiquity that Polycarp suffered in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and on the visit of Polycarp to Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus, which began A.D. 157 or 158. Keim (Aus dem Urchristenthum) protests against blindly following Waddington, and examines with characteristic care and force the letter of the church of Smyrna. Lightfoot in Cont. Rev., vol. xxv. p. 838, follows Waddington.

[2] "Εἴπετε κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς, οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς μακαρίοις Ἰγνατίῳ καὶ Ζωσίμῳ καὶ Ῥούφῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν" (or ἡμῶν), c. 9.

[3] "*Et de ipso Ignatio, et de his, qui cum eo sunt, quod certius agnoveritis, significate.*"

This sentence closes the chapter in the Latin,—the Greek, which is preserved in Eus. H. E. III. 36, stopping short without it. Defenders of the genuineness of the letter, as a whole, admit that c. 13 is not genuine, but an interpolation,—and indeed it is very like one; or say that the Greek only is genuine, this Latin addition being spurious; or say that the Latin is a mistranslation,—that the Greek was probably the indefinite phrase *περὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ*, and that the Latin *qui cum eo sunt* gives erroneously present time.[1] At all events the circumstances do not warrant us in casting away the Epistle as a whole. Another objection is founded on the apparent indications of date as inconsistent with the authorship of Polycarp. Thus "Pray for kings" (*Orate pro regibus*) is supposed to indicate a date in the time of the joint rule of Marcus Antoninus and Verus; but, as a matter of fact, Justin Martyr uses the word *βασιλεῖς* in reference to Antoninus Pius and M. Aurelius. Besides, the injunction is probably general, as in 1 Pet. ii. 17; it certainly reproduces the exhortation of 1 Tim. ii. 2, *παρακαλῶ . . . ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις . . . ὑπέρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων.* Again, the references to heresies are said to aim so clearly at Doketes, and especially at Marcionites, as to be too late for Polycarp; but this cannot be established.[2] It has been supposed that by thus finding indications of a late date it would be possible to discredit the Epistle; but its genuineness is too well established to be overturned by such arguments. As far as any literary production can be regarded as of assured antiquity, this can; and although there may be some uncertainty as to the very year of its origin, its being written by Polycarp is quite certain. And if it really be Polycarp's, the particular date of writing is not of much moment. In any case, it will contain the testimony of John's disciple to the common creed of the Christian Church from the beginning.

We are thus led to examine the passages in which Polycarp comes into contact with the New Testament. But when we adduce particular passages, we must not forget that not in such passages only, but in its whole tone and texture, and in the spirit which it breathes, does this Epistle remind us of the New Testament.

If we could depend upon the Latin version of c. 12 (the Greek

[1] In the Greek are nine chapters—in the Latin are fourteen; but the first chapter is (except one sentence) preserved in the Greek of Eusebius. Lightfoot has shown that the Latin version supplies in all such cases the substantive Latin verb, and, at least in one case, uses *sunt* in reference to persons dead,—see Cont. Rev., vol. xxv. p. 844. Compare Zahn's notes in Geb. and Har., Pat. Ap. *in loc.*, and Zahn's Ignatius, p. 290. The difficulty in each case, however, is whether to give present or past time to the substantive participle: *οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*, with *ὄντες* supplied, would not of itself fix the time, the participle being indefinite.

[2] Irenæus (B. III. 3, 4) tells us that Polycarp called Marcion the firstborn of Satan, —*πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ*; and some have argued that the use of the same words in reference to the denial that "Jesus Christ came in the flesh" is the doing of a forger using the phrase as a catchword to make the Epistle appear to be Polycarp's. But there is nothing distinctive of Marcion in the heresy opposed in this Epistle.

unfortunately fails us), we should have two quotations,—one from Ps. iv. 4 and the other from Eph. iv. 26 joined together,—as being both from the Scriptures, which are called in one clause *Sacræ literæ*, and in another *hæ Scripturæ*.[1]

The principal passage is Ep. to Phil. c. 2, 3 (see p. 112 of our text). The peculiarity of the passage is, that while it resembles both Matthew and Luke, and indeed seems to be made up of them both, it also resembles Clement, and more especially contains that clause ἐλεεῖτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε in Clement, which is not found in the same form in the Gospels.[2] The favourite idea of some, that a lost Gospel is quoted, would really be acceptable here, were it not that Clement and Polycarp differ from each other, as well as from the canonical Gospels. Although they contain that one striking clause in common, their own clauses are in such different order that we cannot regard them as quoting from the same lost source.[3] It seems most natural to believe that they quoted from memory, and that Christian tradition had preserved that clause in this form, or added it to the injunctions embodied in our written records of the Sermon on the Mount.[4] We have a suggestively similar use by Polycarp of 1 Pet. ii. 20, &c. (see passage in our text, p. 305, and note there).

It may further be noticed, that although the writer usually weaves the words or thoughts of the New Testament into his sentences, there are two breaks, and two express quotations or references. He cites the words of Jesus with special solemnity: thus in c. 2 his words are, "As the Lord said teaching;" and in c. 7, "As the Lord said." In this he resembles Clement; and the practice is what we might expect at their early date. These we may call breaks in his writing; the following are quotations or references: "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?" (1 Cor. vi. 2); and again: "In these Scriptures it is said, 'Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'"—Eph. iv. 26 and Ps. iv. 4.

There can be no doubt that Polycarp used freely and frequently the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistles of Paul; but it is needless to dwell upon his citations. The reference to the First Epistle of John is so important in its bearing on the date of the Fourth Gospel, that we may refer to it here. We have a strong statement that he who doth not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is Antichrist (c. 7), and no one can deny that this is a fair condensation of the words of John (1 John iv. 3). It moreover contains John's familiar words: ἀντί-

[1] The passage is very obscure, and apparently corrupt. See text under *Ephesians*, and note, p. 239. Also p. 112.

[2] See on the absence of this clause, following words from some MS authorities, Dressel's note, p. 399.

[3] Cf. Sanday, 'Gospels in the Second Century,' p. 85.

[4] The fact that though the clauses in Polycarp are not in the same order as in Clement, they are in the same form (comp. extracts, pp. 105, 112), is of some significance; the question is to what the significance amounts. The student will find it interesting to compare the passages quoted in the paragraph.

χριστος, ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. There being little doubt that the First Epistle is by the same author as the Gospel, this may be regarded as evidence for the "Gospel of John." It may be that there was "a formula in use in the early Church against various heretics," though no one knows about it; but the words of Polycarp, while quite consistent with the theory that the disciple was freely using his Master's thoughts and expressions, are not so consistent with the formal use of a "formula." Besides, the constant fleeing to some unknown work—an apocryphal Gospel, or a formula—for refuge from the pressure of obvious arguments in favour of the theory of quotation from our well-known canonical writings, is in itself uncritical.

Two remarkable allusions to St Paul are found, c. 3 :—

"These things, brethren, I write unto you concerning righteousness,—not because I take anything upon myself, but because you have invited me to do so. For neither I nor any such other one can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorified Paul. He, when among you, accurately and steadfastly taught the word of truth in the presence of those who were then alive. And when absent from you, he wrote you a letter, which, if you carefully study, you will find to be the means of building you up in that faith which has been given you, and which, being followed by hope, and preceded by love towards God and Christ, and our neighbours, is the mother of us all. For if any one be inwardly possessed of those graces, he hath fulfilled the command of righteousness, since he that hath love is far from all sin."

And again, c. 11 :—

"Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches. But I have neither seen nor heard of any such thing among you, in the midst of whom the blessed Paul laboured, and who are commended in the beginning of his Epistle. For he boasts of you in all those churches which alone knew the Lord; but we [of Smyrna] had not yet known Him." [1]

We could not ask stronger testimony, direct or indirect, to our New Testament than this. Its author — the disciple of John, and the teacher of Irenæus—was a leading and representative man among the Christians during his long life, and "in his old age," as Irenæus says, "had a glorious and splendid martyrdom." To whom, then, does this Saint testify? Not only to the Epistles of his own Master, but to St Peter, and to the writings of St Paul. There is no trace of jealousy; and he is one in spirit with all the "three mighty ones." His whole style closely resembles that of 1 Peter and of the later Epistles of St Paul; and it would seem as if the last of our inspired writings which moulded the faith of his youth, had also moulded his thought and formed his style.

It may not be out of place, in a book primarily designed for students of theology, to draw attention to a practical lesson. Polycarp—now

[1] Probably an allusion to 2 Thess. i. 4, as well as to Philippians : cf. 1 Thess. i. 8.

old and revered—was asked by the Philippians to write them a letter. He accordingly exhorts them to Christian duty and faith; proclaiming the truth as it is in Jesus, "who" (as he says in c. 8) "bore our sins in His own body on the tree," and "for our sakes was raised again from the dead:" but his words are not so remarkable even for their tender courtesy and touching humility, as for the fact that all his exhortations are based on the authority of Holy Scripture. It is not Polycarp as a man who speaks, but a fellow-sinner and fellow-Christian, who has no right nor title to address them, save in so far as God gives him grace to remind them of the revealed Word, which in his own experience he has found to be true and precious beyond all price. Those who are ministers of Christ, especially young ministers, may well take that old man as their model, and say little on their own authority, but let their hearers feel that it is God who beseeches them. It is poor preaching which makes people keep the personality of the preacher in mind. We are called to be followers of Polycarp, as "he also was of Christ."

NOTE.

1. Polycarp.

There are quotations in the text under the head of the various books of the New Testament, showing that Polycarp certainly quotes 1 Peter, 1 John, and several of the Epistles of Paul (indeed all of them, save perhaps Colossians, 2 Timothy, and Titus, and certainly Philemon); that he most probably had the synoptic Gospels (Matthew in particular); and that his use of the First Epistle of John may be supposed to carry a recognition of the fourth Gospel. The references to James, Jude, and 2 Peter are doubtful. I find no trace of the Apocalypse.

But in addition to quotations, we must notice what may be called echoes, or similarities of tone and thought. The following table (I am by no means sure of its being exhaustive, or of the apportionment being always correct) may indicate the amount of quotations and echoes in this remarkable little letter:—

The salutation is—"Polycarp, and the Presbyters who are with him, to the Church of God sojourning at Corinth, grace unto you and peace."

παροικούσῃ, compare 1 Peter i. 17, ii. 11.

ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη, see 2 Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 4; 2 John iii.; and Gal. vi. 16.

This may not be a quotation, yet no one can doubt its being an *echo* of St Paul's form in words from Peter and Paul.

Quotations.	*Echoes.*
C. 1. Direct *quotation* of Acts ii. 24; 1 Peter i. 8; Eph. ii. 8, 9.	C. 1. Rom. vii. 4 (use of καρποφορέω); and Col. ii. 7 (ῥίζα βεβαία).
2. 1 Pet. i. 13; Ps. ii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 21, iv. 5, iii. 9. Synoptists (Sermon on Mount).	2. 1 Cor. xv. 28, or Phil. ii. 10 (ᾧ ὑπετάγη τὰ πάντα); 1 Thess. v. 22 (ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ἀδικίας, κ.τ.λ.)
3. Phil. iii. 1, &c.; 2 Thess. i. 4 (?); Rom. xiii. 9.	

Quotations.

C. 4. 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10; Eph. vi. 11 (2 Cor. vi. 7).
5. Gal. vi. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.
6. Rom. xii. 17 (2 Cor. viii. 21); Rom. xiv. 10 (2 Cor. v. 10).
7. 1 John iv. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 7; Mat. xxvi. 41 (perhaps also vi. 13).
8. 1 Pet. ii. 22, 24, &c.; 1 John iv. 9.
9. Phil. ii. 16 (Gal. ii. 2); 2 Tim. iv. 10.
10. 1 Pet. ii. 17 (Tobit iv. 10, xii. 9); 1 Pet. ii. 12.
11. 1 Cor. vi. 2; Phil. i. 5; Thess. i. 4, iii. 15.
12. Ps. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 26; Gal. i. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 2; Mat. v. 44.

Echoes.

C. 3. 2 Pet. iii. 15; 1 John *passim* (ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην).
4. 1 Thess. v. 17 (ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως); Heb. iv. 12, 13 (λογισμῶν οὔτε ἐννοιῶν, κ.τ.λ.)
5. Gal. v. 7 (common text ἀνακύπτεσθαι); James iii. 2 (χαλιναγωγοῦντες).
6. Mat. vi. 12, 14 (duty of forgiving if we pray for forgiveness, ἀφιέναι); Gal. iv. 18 (ζηλωταὶ περὶ τὸ καλόν).
7. Jude iii.
8. Acts v. 41; 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16 (suffering on account of Christ's name).
9. 2 Tim. ii. 12 (they who suffered with Christ are now with Him).
11. 1 Tim. iii. 5 (*quomodo alii hoc pronuntiant?*); Col. iii. 5 (*avaritia=idololatreia*); 1 Cor. xii. 26 (the body of Christ).
12. Mat. v. 48; Col. i. 28; Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iii. 18.

2. Martyrdom of Polycarp (p. xxxiii).

C. 1, 2. περιέμενεν γὰρ, ἵνα παραδοθῇ, ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα μιμηταὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ γενώμεθα, μὴ μόνον σκοποῦντες τὸ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ τοὺς πέλας—Phil. ii. 4.

2, 3. καὶ τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀνέβλεπον τὰ τηρούμενα τοῖς ὑπομείνασιν ἀγαθὰ ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη, ἐκείνους δὲ ὑπεδείκνυτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, οἵπερ μηκέτι ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἤδη ἄγγελοι ἦσαν—1 Cor. ii. 9. (*Note.*—This use of the prophetic words does not, like St Paul's, refer to the present gifts of the Spirit, but to the glories of a future heaven.)

7, 1. τῇ παρασκευῇ περὶ δείπνου ὥραν ἐξῆλθον διωγμῖται καὶ ἱππεῖς μετὰ τῶν συνήθων αὐτοῖς ὅπλων, ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν τρέχοντες—Mat. xxvi. 55.

7, 1. κἀκεῖθεν δέ ἠδύνατο εἰς ἕτερον χωρίον ἀπελθεῖν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐβουλήθη, εἰπών· τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ γενέσθω—Acts xxi. 14.

10, 2. Ὁ δὲ Πολύκαρπος εἶπεν· σὲ μὲν καὶ λόγου ἠξίωσα· δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ προσῆκον, τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἡμᾶς, ἀπονέμειν—Rom. xiii. 1, 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13.

14, 1. κύριε ὁ θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ—Acts iii. 14, &c.

14, 2. εὐλογῶ σε ὅτι ἠξίωσάς με τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας τάυτης, τοῦ λαβεῖν μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου· ἐν οἷς προσδεχθείην ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον ἐν θυσίᾳ πίονι καὶ προσδεκτῇ, καθὼς προητοίμασας καὶ προεφανέρωσας καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός—Mat. xx. 22; John v. 29; xvii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18.

VI.—PAPIAS.

It would be a great event in Biblical Criticism if the lost five books of Papias were found in some library, as it is not impossible they may yet be. Except their title, and a few scraps in Irenæus and Eusebius, and in writers long after their time, we really know nothing about the books of this old chronicler. The title of his treatise was "an Exposition (or Expositions) of the Oracles of the Lord"—Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις (or ἐξηγήσεις); and it seems to have been a collection of our Lord's most important sayings and doings, with Papias's own commentary, and certain additions to corroborate the commentary—these additions being drawn from what Papias had collected as unwritten reminiscences.[1] The importance of the book lies in the fact that Papias, like Polycarp, was a link between the apostolic age and that of Irenæus. Irenæus[2] calls him "Papias, a man of the olden time, the hearer of John and companion of Polycarp." As Irenæus himself was a native of Asia Minor, and seems to have been at one time in Laodicea, it is neither impossible nor improbable that in his youth he had met the old Bishop of Hierapolis.[3] Eusebius, indeed, throws doubt upon the words of Irenæus, denying that Papias himself ever claimed to be a hearer and eyewitness of the holy Apostles. But Eusebius, with characteristic honesty, enables us to judge for ourselves, and a judgment in accordance with his is by no means unavoidable. Without here entering minutely into the controversy, it is enough to say that the few sentences which remain to us from Papias descriptive of his purpose may fairly be taken to mean that he at first learned not a little from the Apostles themselves,[4] and that afterwards, during his whole life, he had added to his personal reminiscences those which he was able to collect from other companions of the Apostles. His first words are, "I shall certainly not refuse to set down for you, along with my interpretations, what things I well learned from the elders, and well recorded [or re-

[1] Lightfoot, Cont. Rev., vol. xxvi. p. 399. Bishop Lightfoot's discussion of the subject seems to me so conclusive, that I merely refer to the results as securely established.

[2] B. V. 33, 4.

[3] See Geb. and Har., p. 189. The tradition rests mainly on Armenian authority, and Jerome uses words which seem to be thus confirmed,—"*Refert Irenæus . . . Papiæ auditoris evangelistæ Joannis discipulus.*"

[4] Compare Eus. Chronic. Irenæus and others relate that John remained in life until the times of Trajan: μεθ' ὃν Παπίας Ἱεραπολίτης καὶ Πολύκαρπος Σμύρνης ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουσταὶ ἐγνωρίζοντο. (See Geb. and Har. (Zahn), Pat. Ap., p. 187.)

membered[1]], being well assured of the truth concerning them. For I was in the habit of taking delight (not like the many) in those having much to say, but in those teaching the things that are true: nor in those recalling the precepts of strangers, but in those recalling the things given by the Lord to faith [or, to make Christian verity], and proceeding from the truth itself [or, from the very Truth,—see John xiv. 6]. And if anywhere there chanced also to come one who had been in company with the Elders [see Luke's Preface], I inquired into the words of the Elders: what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas (said), or James: or what John or Matthew or some other one of the disciples of the Lord (said): which things [or, what things] Aristion and John the Elder say. For I did not account myself so much indebted to the things which come from books, as to those which come from the living and abiding voice." (Text, p. 54.)

There can be no reasonable doubt that, from a natural interpretation of his words, we learn that at the time when Papias wrote, Aristion and the Presbyter John were living and adding to his stock of reminiscences. At a later period in his narrative, Eusebius tells us that Papias had received at least one wonderful narrative from the daughters of Philip the Apostle. There may be some doubt of his exact date, but there can be none as to his living at the period when our authorities are fewest, and every word they left unspeakably precious. Still further, Eusebius tells us that Papias, "who seemed very weak in the mind,"[2] had given a literal and physical interpretation of certain figurative prophecies spoken by our Lord. The subject of these prophecies was the millennium: and Eusebius, who was a keen anti-millennarian, denounces all those (he instances Irenæus) who were so led away "by respect for the antiquity of the man" as to follow his weak-headed expositions. In another passage, however, Eusebius calls him a very learned man.[3] There is some difficulty at first sight in believing that Eusebius at one time thus praised and at another thus disparaged Papias, and hence probably the omission of one of those expressions in some MS authorities. But it is quite possible to be a man of lore and yet not much of a thinker, so that Eusebius's estimate of the two sides of Papias's character may be allowed to remain, and is probably true. When, therefore, we find Papias giving

[1] *Ἐμνημόνευσα.* We have this word used by Papias in the next sentence with the meaning "record" or "relate;" and in the comments of Eusebius which follow, we have it used in the same way,—"*αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας.*" It may be taken in the same sense here, and may intimate that Papias from an early date took notes of what he heard from the Elders. If so, his *ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ των πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα* are words of special importance. They deliberately claim for his work all the accuracy of which pains and opportunity could make him capable. *Διαβεβαιούμενος* will convey the same idea of "well-grounded conviction" in his own mind.

[2] "*Σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν . . . φαίνεται.*"—H. E. III. 39.

[3] "*Ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων.*"—H. E. III. 36.

interesting particulars regarding the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the question with which we have mainly to do is not his intellect, but his honesty. If he knew our Gospels, they must have been in men's hands in his day: for "weakness of intellect does not enable one to speak of books as existing which are not in existence."[1]

This leads us to a somewhat more special inquiry as to what his day was. If he were really a disciple of the Apostles, and if he lived in Asia Minor at the time when John wrote his Gospel, he becomes a man of great importance in the controversies regarding the fourth Gospel, as well as regarding Matthew and Mark. We do not know when he was born, nor do we know when he died,[2] but he must have met many of the apostolic age; and we may regard the disciple of John, the friend of Polycarp, the contemporary of Philip's daughters, the man who seemed to Irenæus a "man of the early times" (ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ), the man who knew both the "elders" and their younger associates, as having flourished during the first and second quarters of the second century, and as having lived from about A.D. 70 to about A.D. 150.

All that we have of Papias's writing will be found in our text. It is all quite consistent with his character as a well-intentioned caterer of tradition. It is not consistent with the theory that he was trying to compile either a supplement to our Gospels in an authoritative sense, or a substitute in any sense whatever. Nay, we must go further and add that, so far as those extracts go, they seem conclusively to point to a man who accepted the authoritative records of Christ's life which were accepted by the Church. If he speaks of the Gospels, it is to give some traditions regarding their origin which were likely to be of interest to future generations. If he speaks of the sayings of our Lord, it is to give an exposition of them, and to back up his own exposition by traditional expansion and illustrative anecdote.[3]

And what, then, does this "man of the olden time" say about our Gospels? In our text (p. 57) will be found proof that he gives explicit testimonies to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, to the first Epistles of John and Peter, and to the Apocalypse of John. The reference to the Acts of the Apostles is doubtful, but I think it probably is made by Eusebius himself, and not by Papias. After Lightfoot's article on "The Silence of Eusebius"[4] there is no need to assume that Papias's references were confined to those books of the

[1] Norton, Genuineness of Gospels, vol. i. p. 76.

[2] The Paschal Chronicle (seventh century) has usually been regarded as fixing his martyrdom in A.D. 164; but the chronicler or his transcriber has evidently made a mistake in substituting "Papias" for "Papylus" in copying the narrative of Eusebius, so that we know nothing of the date of Papias's death. See Lightfoot, as above, p. 382.

[3] Perhaps this is generalising rather too much from the long passage preserved by Irenæus.

[4] Cont. Rev., vol. xxv.

canon. But there is abundant controversy as to the bearing of what Papias has undoubtedly said.

The main points are (α) that Matthew's Gospel was written in Hebrew, and (β) that Mark's Gospel was composed from what Peter said in the course of preaching; (γ) that the First Epistle of John was an authority to Papias, and (δ) an Epistle of Peter likewise. There is also a statement by Eusebius that "Papias brings forward another narrative about a woman accused of many crimes before the Lord. Which story," adds Eusebius, "the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains." Without entering on the controversy as to the rendering of the passages, which will speak for themselves, we may say that the notice of Matthew is far too fragmentary to bear much strain: and yet it has been used as though it were a rounded treatise. As it stands, it would naturally lead to an account of the origin of the Greek version of St Matthew, which terminated the time of confusion, when "every man" (*i.e.*, every man who—like Papias himself?—did not know Hebrew very well) "interpreted as he was able" the original Hebrew of Matthew. As it stands,—and without reference to what may have followed,—it tells us that at first Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and that at that date there was some difficulty in many quarters in interpreting him, because the language was Hebrew. It does not tell us that this difficulty existed at the time when Papias wrote. It does *not* tell us that Matthew's λόγια, or oracles, were only sacred sayings;—for the natural meaning of λόγια is sacred oracles, whether containing narrative or speech.[1] (See note, p. 57.)

And as to Mark's Gospel, Papias (p. 56) tells us that Mark wrote with precision (ἀκριβῶς), but not in exact order (τάξει), the words and works of Christ. There has been infinite dispute as to the meaning of Papias's apologetic reference to the want of exact order (τάξις . . . σύνταξις) in Mark; but surely we might accept it as a fact that no one definite principle of arrangement, whether from regard to time or to subject, has yet been discovered for any one of our Gospels.[2] The want of this is quite consistent with each Gospel having a beginning and end determined by chronology. So far as Papias is concerned, we are left to the conclusion of the Muratorian Chronicler that, notwithstanding various differences, the essentials of the Christian faith are, under the direction of one supreme Spirit, taught in all the several books of our Gospels.[3] It is to be noted, also, that when we read of

[1] See Lightfoot, as above, p. 400.

[2] The arguments (*e.g.*, Sanday's) to show that Mark's Gospel is probably nearer to the normal order than any other, seem to be beside the point. What Papias wants to say is, that Mark does not profess to have the one only true order; so that disputes on that head (such as seem to have been going on) are unnecessary.

[3] See Muratorian Fragment. It is there said that the differences are in the *principia*, which we may perhaps take to mean the *heads* of contents; and this may refer to the subject or to the arrangement of those heads.

Papias adducing testimonies from the First Epistle of John, we have every reason to believe that he used the Fourth Gospel as John's, for the common authorship of the Gospel and Epistle is too obvious to be seriously disputed.

NOTE.

The tradition that the Apostle John lived in Ephesus.

New interest has attached to the fragments of Papias since Keim's publication of his bold theory,[1] in which Papias plays a prominent part. Although it bears chiefly on the authorship of the fourth Gospel, and on some passages of Irenæus in connection therewith, it nevertheless has its origin in Papias, and may therefore be fitly considered at this stage. Keim admits, nay proves, the early date of the composition of the fourth Gospel, and places it in Trajan's time, between A.D. 110 and 117. As Irenæus expressly says (Book II. 22, 5) that John lived till Trajan's time—*i.e.*, A.D. 98-117—we might suppose that the authorship of the fourth Gospel was at last settled by the critics. But Keim, while holding by the date, denies that the son of Zebedee is the Evangelist, and wishes to make out that another John, the Presbyter John, of whose very existence not a few able writers are doubtful, is the veritable hero of Church History in Asia Minor, and the true winner of the fame which has been allowed to gather round the name of the son of Zebedee. He charges the mistake originally upon Irenæus, from whom he says all others copied; and in denying that Papias knew John the Apostle, he also denies that Polycarp did. His position, shortly stated, is a denial that the Apostle John was ever in Ephesus. He dwells upon the absence of all allusion to John in Asia Minor by Ignatius and Polycarp in their genuine writings, and then comes to deal with the well-known statements of Papias, as contained in Eus. H. E. III. 39. He makes a great deal of Papias having had no intercourse with the Apostle John, or with any other Apostle; and asks how, that being so, it is possible to believe that Polycarp, his neighbour and friend, was so intimate with the son of Zebedee as tradition has made him out to be. The true solution, according to Keim, is, that the teacher of Papias and of Polycarp, the author of Papias's chiliastic hallucinations, and the hero of the traditions of Asia Minor, was not the son of Zebedee, but another John,—John the Presbyter.

We may sum up Keim's position thus:—

1. Papias did not know any Apostle: this Keim takes from Eusebius.
2. Papias had once known Aristion and John the Presbyter.
3. Papias had learnt from them what the Apostles said (Keim says Papias does not say this; but Keim infers it from other statements of Eusebius).
4. When Eusebius does mention John the Apostle, he puts him so low in the list of Apostles as to show that John had no more to do with Asia Minor than Matthew had.
5. John the Presbyter was the author of the chiliastic fantasies in the minds of Papias, Irenæus, and others.

To these it must be replied:—

1. That Keim is going too far in denying Papias's personal acquaintance with an Apostle. He may have known some of them, although his thirst for knowledge was

---

[1] The references are to Keim's Jesus v. Nazara (1867), vol. i. p. 143, &c. English transl., vol. i. p. 207 (see p. vi. note 2). There is a full discussion in Max Krenkel's 'Der Apostel Johannes,' 1872.

so great, that he had always tried to learn from everybody who knew them what they had said about the Lord. It is quite possible to have known great men, and yet to be indebted to others for many reminiscences of them. And we have seen some reason to believe that this was so with Papias.

2. In point of fact, he does not *say* in the passage mainly founded on that he had even seen Aristion and John the Presbyter.

3. He had learnt from everybody what the Apostles said; and he seems to quote Aristion and John the Presbyter as confirming the trustworthiness of his memoranda.

4. The low place of John in the list either means nothing or too much for Keim's purpose; for if the list were taken for an order of merit, it would contradict the teaching of the New Testament, that John was at least greater than Philip or Thomas. Krenkel supposes that they were mentioned in the order of the date of their death (*e. g.*, Philip died much earlier than John). Lightfoot suggests that they were mentioned in the same order as in John's Gospel. Had John the Presbyter been as famous as Keim supposes, would not Keim's own principles lead us to expect him to be earlier in the list of disciples than that obscure Aristion? Can it be that John and Matthew are mentioned together as being the two Evangelists?

5. Eusebius does not refer the hallucinations of Papias to John, but says that Papias misunderstood the apostolical expositions. Even if the "elders" quoted by Irenæus mean Papias, and such as he, any extravagances may be due to them, and not to their teacher.[1] In addition, let us note the well-known fact that Irenæus says he knew Polycarp intimately. (See Irenæus's letter to Florinus.) Is it conceivable that he could be mistaken as to the John of whom his master was wont to speak so constantly? Is it possible that he would have written to a fellow-scholar (now a Gnostic), reminding him of this John, if he were not sure that his correspondent knew for certain which John he meant? Further, if Irenæus were mistaken as to Polycarp's meaning, could he have continued under the mistake after reading Papias's book? We must conclude, after considering such questions as these, that Polycarp intended his disciples to suppose that he spoke of the son of Zebedee, and we cannot assume that the old man deliberately set himself to deceive them.

Finally, there is independent testimony in favour of John the Apostle having been in Ephesus. Apollonius, the anti-Montanist (A.D. 170-180), believed in the Ephesian residence of the Apostle John (Eus. H. E. V. 18); and Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus (A.D. 180), expressly refers to "John who rested on the bosom of our Lord" as being buried in Ephesus.[2]

Tradition takes strange shapes, as we see in the reminiscences of Irenæus himself; but they are in matters of detail. History could never be written at all, if it were possible for Irenæus to be mistaken upon a subject so broad and momentous as Polycarp's training under the Apostle John.

---

[1] There is not even proof that Papias took the parable about "ten thousand fold" literally, though Irenæus did.

[2] Eusebius tells us (H. E. III. 39) of two *μνήματα* (tombs? or memorials?) in Ephesus; and the only doubt attaching to them seems to have regarded the Presbyter. In Ignatius ad Eph., c. 11, 2 (Vossian), there is probable reference to Paul and John in Ephesus, *ἵνα ἐν κλήρῳ Ἐφεσίων εὑρεθῶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, οἳ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντοτε συνῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. See Zahn ('Acta Joannis,' 1880, p. cliv.), for a new excursus on the tombs.

VII.—BASILIDES.

It is scarcely possible to sketch the position of Basilides in the history of evidence for the canonical books without indicating his position as a philosophical teacher and the founder of a sect. He is said (Euseb. H. E. IV.) to have written "twenty-four books upon the Gospel;" and controversy immediately begins as to what "the Gospel" was, and what is meant by writing upon it? And the shortest answer to questions which spring up must include some notice of his general position.

Basilides was born in Syria, and was possibly, along with Saturninus, a disciple of Menander. He went to Egypt, like Cerinthus, and was known there about A.D. 125.[1] He seems also to have taught the Persians (see p. 390). He was the author of a notable Gnostic theory of the universe, and he claimed for it that it truly represented the teaching of Peter. His system is expounded at considerable length by Irenæus and by Hippolytus, and is often alluded to and confuted by Clement of Alexandria.[2] It is not easy to reconstruct it from these notices; nor is it always possible to say how far his followers had gone beyond his own lines.[3] But he seems to have sought to embrace all the universe in one plan, of which Jesus Christ is the centre, and to have broken down in the attempt to combine Egyptian speculation with Scripture truth. He was anxious, with Egyptian sages, to maintain that the supreme God cannot reveal Himself;[4] he was equally anxious, with Christians, to admit that the Old and New Testaments contain a real and true revelation; and so he invented "Archons" great enough to be authors of revelation. He did not take refuge in the notion of the inherent evil of matter: he believed creation and providence to be the works of God. He even said, "I would say anything rather than blame Providence."[5] The mysteries of the world he believed to be

[1] There is concurrence from all sides in his having flourished in Hadrian's reign, A.D. 117-138.

[2] See a collection of passages containing fragments of the writings of the Gnostics to whom Irenæus alludes in Stieren's Irenæus, vol. i. p. 901, &c.

[3] Clem. Alex. (Strom. III. 1, p. 510) expressly says that the founders of the sect do not sanction his contemporaries, the Basilideans, in their Antinomian tenet that sins of incontinence do not hurt the perfect man, *ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ταῦτα αὐτοῖς πράττειν συγχωροῦσιν οἱ προπάτορες τῶν δογμάτων.* Lardner does not succeed in explaining this away. See Lardner, vol. i. p. 543.

[4] Probably it was owing to his Egyptian training that he is said (see Eus. H. E. IV. 11) to have spoken of Barcabbas and Barcoph as prophets, and others also. Isidore, his son, also commented on Parchor—(Clem. Alex., Strom. VI. 6, p. 767).

[5] Clem. Alex., Strom. IV. 12, p. 600.

due to our inability to see causes and effects together. And yet when, in his attempt to lessen the mystery of creation out of nothing, he says that from the unknown supreme God there came a germ out of which all existing things were evolved, he is forced to hold that in this germ were several grades of being, of which the lowest seems to be somehow bound up meanwhile with material existence from which it will be eventually disengaged. It seems, therefore, as though the necessary result of the unthinkable God producing the germ was the production of the material world along with the spiritual. It seems as though moral evil were only imperfection caused by the proximity of some substance less refined than pure spirit. And from this tenet would easily come many of the gross immoral consequences in practical conduct with which even Clement of Alexandria charges his school.[1] Clement shows that a pure moral condition is not with the Basilideans a result of God's forgiveness and of the work of God in man, but of antecedent necessity arising from the composition of the human nature in the particular individual.[2] In short, with Basilides, as with all who magnify the influence of matter, the fact and the sense of sin were obscured.[3] Nevertheless Basilides scouted the idea of emanations,[4] and thought that he had bridged the chasm between spirit and the universe by the invention of his eggs or germs with resulting Archons—one the head of an ogdoad, and the other of a hebdomad; and he thought that he had found a central place for Jesus Christ[5] by representing Him as the embodiment of the great Gospel with which the Archon's Son enlightened all the principalities and powers, and all different orders of being, including man.

It is easy to see that his aim was to expand and explain the teaching of John's Gospel as to the creation by the Logos, and the mysterious allusions in some of the Pauline Epistles to God reconciling all things (τὰ πάντα) to Himself by Jesus Christ.[6] His system was a philosophy, not a religion: a philosophy, however, applying to practical life, and not merely an intellectual exercitation.

[1] Clem. Alex., Strom. III. 1, p. 510, &c. Bunsen (Hipp. 1, 111) thinks that Basilides "clung to the old philosophy of Egypt and Asia, that evil triumphs in this world of ours." But this does not seem to be accurate.

[2] Ibid., II. 20, p. 488. Οἱ δ' ἀμφὶ Βασιλείδην προσαρτήματα τὰ πάθη καλεῖν εἰώθασιν.

[3] See Clem. Alex., Strom. III. 1, p. 510, for an allegation that Isidorus recommended a man to gratify pressing lusts in order that he might pray with more devout mind.

[4] See text under John's Gospel—Basilides.

[5] "Since it was needful that it should be revealed that we are the children of God, in expectation of whose revelation the creation groaned and habitually travailed in pain, the Gospel came into the world and permeated all authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named."—Hipp. 7, 13.

[6] Jerome says he rejected Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews. This is probable enough in itself, as the contents of those books must have stood in the way of his system; but other antagonists do not charge him with either rejecting or mutilating (however much he perverted) any of the books of the New Testament. See Jerome, Pref. to Comment. on Titus.

He did not wish to be an opponent of the Gospel; and he professed to represent the true doctrines of St Peter, which he had received through his teacher Glaucias, the interpreter of Peter.[1] He (or his followers for him) also claimed to expound the doctrine of Matthias, who had received it privately from the Saviour Himself.[2] In this, like other Gnostics, he wished to find some excuse for his obvious disagreement with the Gospel of Christ as ordinarily received among men. The twenty-four books of which Eusebius tells us—"exegetical books" Clement calls them; "tractates" according to Archelaus—seem to have been discourses advocating his own philosophy of religion. The curious paraphrases of important texts preserved by Hippolytus, and the equally curious ethical consequences which roused the wrath of Clement, seem to me to make this clear enough. And is there any improbability in the supposition that he issued also some abridgment of this as his own view of the Gospel—as Christianity according to Basilides?[3] Origen says: "Basilides was audacious enough to write a Gospel, and to call it by his own name." And Origen—or rather the Latin version of Origen's Homilies on Luke—remains our authority for this. Even if we take Origen's statement as fact, we cannot interpret this as meaning that Basilides used a form of the Gospel according to the Hebrews,[4] or that he set up any narrative as a rival to the canonical books, because we do not hear anything about such a book from those who wrote most fully of his system, and we do hear explicitly that he and his followers adopted the same account of the Saviour's life as other Christians did. After an account of Jesus' birth, Hippolytus (III. 27) says: "After His [Jesus'] birth had taken place as aforesaid, all things regarding the Saviour, according to them [the Basilideans], took place as has been written in the Gospels." And Clement tells us that they observed the night of the Lord's baptism as a festival, spending it in special reading.[5]

We conclude, therefore, from the allusions and quotations in early writers, that Basilides was not known to reject any of the books of the New Testament; that he set himself to reconcile the Christian Scriptures with Egyptian philosophy; that he wrote an elaborate treatise in twenty-four books on "the Gospel," by which we suppose that he meant the Christian system;[6] that his system led to well-understood

[1] Clem. Alex., Strom. VII. 17, p. 898.

[2] See Hipp. VII. 20, and Clem. Alex., Strom. VII. 17. Some read "Matthew" here. According to Clement, it was the boast of Basilides's followers that he claimed Glaucias for his teacher,—"κἂν Γλαυκίαν ἐπιγράφηται διδάσκαλον ὡς αὐχοῦσιν αὐτοί,"—whereas the claim to represent Matthew or Matthias may be the doing of his followers, although this is not clear. Hippolytus distinctly says that both Basilides and Isidore made this claim. He calls Isidore the "genuine son and disciple" of Basilides.

[3] "Εὐαγγέλιον ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἡ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων γνῶσις."—Hipp. Hær. 7, 27.

[4] Sup. Rel., vol. ii. p. 43.

[5] Clem. Alex., Strom. I. 21, p. 408.

[6] I do not see that we can go further than this from the words of Eusebius; but

consequences as to the evil of matter and the non-importance of bodily indulgence, which, in the lives of his followers, produced flagrant immorality. When we go further, and ask what the written records were from which he quoted, or on which he commented, we can not only say that he accepts the facts of ordinary Christian narrative, but we have also good grounds for believing that they were our canonical books, because we find passages from Matthew and Luke and John. Those passages are found in our text, with specific notes, and the reader is referred to them. They refer to the Magi and the star (Mat. ii. 1); to eunuchs and continence (Mat. xix. 11); to casting pearls before swine (Mat. vii. 6); to the Holy Spirit overshadowing the mother of Jesus, and the power of the Highest coming upon her (Luke i. 35); to the saying of Jesus found in the Fourth Gospel, "Mine hour is not yet come" (John ii. 4); and, above all, to the language of the Prologue, "This is the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John i. 9). There are numerous passages from the fact that they are preceded by such phrases as *τὸ εἰρημένον, ὡς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει.*[1] It is to be observed, also, that when we are told of the Basilideans accepting the Gospel record, it is described as "what is written in the Gospels;"[2] and when the Prologue to John is quoted, it is as "said in the Gospels." Do we go beyond the indications when we conclude that while "the Gospel" meant the "Christian system," the Basilideans acknowledged a plurality of books which correspond with our own, and that they termed these, as we do, "the Gospels"?

But it is said in reply that the quotations of Hippolytus are so indefinite as to make it doubtful whether he quoted from Basilides himself or from some Basilidean of much later date.[3] The value of the quotations from John depends on the weight attached to this reply. It does not seem to me possible to read Hipp. VII. 22, with its distinct

we can certainly deny, on the strength of the passage, any theory that Basilides's work was a commentary on his own Gospel. Hippolytus (Ref. 7, 27) says: "Gospel is with the Basilideans the knowledge of supra-mundane things;" and he goes on to define these as the Holy Spirit and the Sonship, and adds: "This, according to them, is the Gospel," *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.* This meaning is also found in the passage quoted in a previous note (see note 3), to the effect that the Gospel is the revelation that we are the sons of God.

[1] Thus, in one chapter, VII. 26 (p. 372, Duncker), we find *τὸ εἰρημένον* for Prov. i. 7; Ps. xxxi. 5; Luke i. 35 (a strictly verbal quotation); *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει* for 1 Cor. ii. 13; *καθὼς γέγραπται* for 2 Cor. xii. 4; besides an inweaving of Eph. iii. 3. And vii. 22, puts in apposition, *τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ Μωσέως*, "Let there be light," and *τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις*, "He was the true light," &c. In this same chapter (22), Ps. cxxxii. 2 is cited as *τὸ λεγόμενον.*

[2] Not "in the Gospel," as Sup. Rel., vol. i. p. 47.

[3] Hipp., VII. 19, says that Basilides will be convicted of foisting Aristotelian philosophy upon the Gospel, so that his followers will be made to see that they are pagans, not true Christians at all. Then he goes on (VII. 20) to show how manifestly Basilides, as well as Isidore and their whole sect, give the lie not only to Matthew, but to the Saviour Himself.

bearing on Basilides himself, as shown by the way Hippolytus introduces him, and to suppose that any one but Basilides is meant as the author by whom the Prologue to John (i. 9) is founded upon.[1] The other quotation in c. 27 naturally seems to be made by Basilides also, even although, in the following sentence, the whole school (*κατ' αὐτούς*) are said to apply the doctrine to the spiritual man within the natural man. But even if we give up the second, the first mentioned of the citations from John by Basilides remains distinct. This is a question of fact to which no doubt a reader's prepossessions tend to shape his reply, however much he may strive to be impartial. But I would submit that the difficulty of referring it to any other than Basilides is enormous.[2] The fundamental written dogma of the school is at stake; Hippolytus is showing how that dogma was against the theory of emanations: he is not dealing (as Clement often did) with practical consequences, but with the very foundation itself; and if that foundation was not laid by Basilides himself, by whom was it laid? Beyond the trouble into which opponents of the authenticity of John are put by Basilides's quoting, is there any ground for believing that in the Basilidean school there was another great philosopher and writer subsequent to the founder's own day who was accepted, when Hippolytus wrote eighty or a hundred years after, as the true representative and champion of Basilidean philosophy? We know of Basilides and his works; we know he had many followers, who are often spoken of as plural; but who is this other notable *one?*[3] It can hardly have been Isidore, who was a much inferior man to his father;[4] and we know not that any other existed great enough.

But again, it is said that the very use of the formulæ, "It is written," &c., shows that the citations are not made by Basilides, because in his day such formulæ were not applied to the New Testament. Is not this, however, to beg the question? If Basilides applied them, they were so applied. "But," says the author of 'Supernatural Religion,' "the writings of pseudo-Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Papias,

[1] In one passage (VII. 26) Hipp. seems to distinguish between the primary doctrines of Basilides and the secondary ones (Abraxas, &c.) of his followers. See *φησί* and *κατ' αὐτούς*. It is often said that in Hipp. V. 7 we have *φασὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες*, and then soon after Pindar quoted with *φησί*, though Pindar is not named. But is it not rather the representative of the Naassenes who is referred to? He was quoted with *φησί* in the end of the previous chapter, and now it is not Pindar but this same man as using the hymn (which the Greeks use) that is quoted.

[2] "L'auteur des *Philosophoumena* a sans doute fait cette analyse sur les ouvrages originaux de Basilide."—Rénan, l'Eglise chrétienne, p. 158.

[3] Hippolytus, at the end of the extract beginning *ἐκεῖνοι λέγουσι*, seems to specify a single contemporary doctrine for which the word *φησίν* shows that he holds Basilides himself responsible. After the reference to the star (VII. 27) with *φησί*, he says: "*Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κατ' αὐτοὺς νενοημένος ἔσω ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός.*"

[4] And the author of Sup. Rel. agrees with orthodox critics that Isidore cannot be shown from his extant fragments to have used Scripture in the same way, or at all. —Sup. Rel., vol. ii. p. 48.

Hegesippus, and others of the Fathers, in several ways positively demonstrate that the New Testament writings were not admitted, even amongst orthodox Fathers, to the rank of Holy Scripture until a very much later period."[1] It is not easy to say what he means in this connection by *pseudo-Ignatius* or his date, seeing that he refers the Ignatian epistles elsewhere to the end of the second or beginning of the third century,—"if indeed they possess any value at all." Is "Ignatius," after all, a genuine witness for the usage in Basilides's day? Or does he mean to say that in the beginning of the third century men did not regard the New Testament as Scripture? As to *Justin Martyr*, he wrote no commentary on the Gospel which has come to our day, nor did he found a philosophical system on it; and his Apology to heathen, and disputation with a Jew, are works of a very different kind from a treatise intended to commend Christian philosophy to Christians. Reverent quotations are natural in such a treatise—natural even if the reverence were consciously hollow,—still more natural if Basilides had honestly convinced himself that his philosophy was a framework in which the Gospel truths could be combined in new beauty and power. On *Polycarp*—we presume the epistle bearing his name is meant—the author heaps strong condemnation elsewhere, saying that "upon no internal ground can any part of this epistle be pronounced genuine; there are potent reasons for considering it spurious, and there is no evidence of any value whatever supporting its authenticity. In any case it could only be connected with the very latest years of Polycarp's life," —*i.e.*, some time after A.D. 160, when he was a deputy sent to Rome. And how, then, can an unauthentic letter of, say A.D. 162, tell us how a philosopher and legate, thirty years before, was likely to use written Gospels? As to the scraps of *Papias*, and the fragments of *Hegesippus*, it is really beside the point to speak of them in this connection. We might indeed found on Papias's testimony to the existence of Matthew and Mark before his time, and on what Hegesippus tells us of the purity and sound doctrine of the Church everywhere in his day. We might show from them how necessary it would be for Basilides to deal respectfully with the Christian records if he wished to get a hearing from contemporary Christians. But without taking any such positive ground, we may well negatively remind ourselves that to quote fragments of chroniclers and historians as guides in what must have been the mode of quotation adopted by a philosophical exegete is unwarrantable.

We conclude, therefore, that Basilides knew, quoted, and commented upon John's Gospel about the end of the first quarter of the second century.[2]

[1] Sup. Rel., vol. ii. p. 55.

[2] There are also references to several of the Pauline Epistles. See Hort's article "Basilides" in Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography, 1877.

Note on the System of Basilides.

There is some difficulty in reconciling Irenæus and Hippolytus in the accounts they give of the system. Some (see Luthardt, St John, p. 100) give up the problem. But it may be suggested that Irenæus seems to begin lower down in the stream of Basilides's thought than Hippolytus. Irenæus seems to strike in at the stage of the Archons. Irenæus speaks of the "unknown Father," who may be regarded as "the unknown God" in the account given by Hippolytus; but he says that "Nous was the first-born of the unborn Father, and Nous is the Christ who came at a later stage to bestow deliverance on them that believe in Him from the power of those who made the world. He appeared then on earth as a man to the nations of these powers, and wrought miracles." In this Irenæus seems to regard the chief Archon as the unborn Father; and, omitting the incomprehensible superfluous speculations on the Deity and the germ, to begin at once with the supreme Archon. We seem to have in his account an enumeration of the powers or attributes that composed the Ogdoad of which Hippolytus speaks elliptically; for although Irenæus does not speak of the Ogdoad, he does enumerate Nous, Logos, Phronesis, Sophia, Dunamis, as successive generations—five in number; and we learn from Clem. Alex. that Dikaiosune and Eirene were also in the list. These, with the Supreme Being, make an Ogdoad, and thus we have Irenæus in substantial agreement with Hippolytus, although he gives rather the substance and issues than the foundation of the speculations of Basilides. Hence those speculations appear more pantheistic in Hippolytus, more dualistic in Irenæus,—the former being the intention of the philosopher, but the latter the necessity which ruled him.

VIII.—JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin Martyr,—a native of Samaria, apparently a Gentile by birth, certainly uncircumcised; originally a student of philosophy (the Platonic in particular), afterwards attracted to the side of the Christians by their disregard of carnal enjoyments and their contempt for death, and finally, not only a believer in the Gospel, but a witness for it in various parts of the earth, even unto death,—is especially important in the history of the canon, because of the position he occupies as equidistant from the Apostle John on the one hand and Irenæus on the other. In recent years the recovery of the long-lost work of Hippolytus, and of the close of the Clementine Homilies, has made Justin's testimony less solitary than it seemed formerly to be. When the philosophical Gnostic,[1] as reported by Hippolytus, founds upon John's Gospel, and the ultra-Judaic Christian[2] does the same, the contemporary (or sub-

[1] Basilides, in Hipp. VII. 10.

[2] Clem. Hom. XIX. 22.

sequent) testimony of Justin is no longer an isolated position open to attack from all sides.

But still there is something special in Justin's work which demands close attention. His first "Apology" was probably presented to the Roman emperor between A.D. 139 and A.D. 146. It is about 40 years since the Apostle John died; 30 or 40 years afterwards (A.D. 177) Irenæus succeeded to the bishopric of Lyons. We do not know for certain the date of Justin's birth, but he was in all probability a contemporary of both the Apostle and the great Gallican Bishop. The Asiatic and the Roman Churches with which they were respectively associated must have been familiarly known to him, for his "Dialogue" was held in Ephesus, and he lived also in Rome. He is a link, too, between what we may call the direct line and many collateral sections of the Christian Church. Being a native of Samaria, he speaks of the great Samaritan heresiarch *Simon*, as one whose life and work in Rome and in Samaria were familiarly known to him. *Menander*, the other Samaritan heretic, had disciples still living who believed in his promise that because of their adherence to him they should never die. And though his work against the great heretic of Sinope is unfortunately lost, we know that he was well aware of the nature of the heresy. "And there is *Marcion*, a native of Pontus, who is even at this day alive and teaching his disciples to believe in some other God greater than the Creator."[1]

It is even possible that Rome may have contained within its walls at one and the same time Marcion, Cerdo, Tatian, Valentinus, and Justin Martyr. We have knowledge of what Marcion's Canon contained; we know that Tatian, Justin's pupil, made a harmony of the four Gospels;[2] we know that Valentinus used a complete canon (*integrum instrumentum*); we know how clear and full is the testimony of Justin's younger contemporary, Irenæus, to the existence and general reception of all the principal parts of our canon; and we might expect to find Justin giving evidence on the same side. If the Gospels and Epistles received by Irenæus were the same as Justin used, then is our chain of testimony complete.

But here arises the question which has for a hundred years bulked more largely than any other in the critical controversies regarding the history of the canon. There can be no doubt that Justin makes large and interesting reference to the life and words of Jesus Christ; and there can be no doubt that he refers for evidence to writ-

[1] Apol. I. c. 26. (Hort fixes A.D. 145 or 146 for the Apology.)

[2] Is it possible that Justin used a harmony, which the pupil afterwards developed into the famous Diatessarôn? or that Justin's mode of quoting, by fusing the synoptic narratives into such consistency as served his purpose, suggested to Tatian the idea of thoroughly fusing them? It is doubtful if Tatian's was a "harmony" in the sense of collocation. Certainly Tatian's was not the same as Justin's, because Tatian omitted the genealogies, and the descent of Jesus from David.

ten documents. There can be no doubt of the substantial conformity of his version of evangelical history with that of our Gospels; but the question is, whether the canonical Gospels are the sources of his quotations? It has been alleged that he quoted from the now lost "Ur-Evangelium" or primary Gospel, or that (Stroth) the mysterious "Gospel of the Hebrews" is his authority. It has been alleged that he quoted from apocryphal books, either in preference to, or along with, the canonical: and, on the other hand, it has been alleged—more accurately, we think—that he knew and habitually cited our canonical books, but that he cited them loosely from memory, and that he did not hesitate on occasion to weave into his statement such additional particulars as he derived from tradition or from apocryphal sources.

We turn to his writings to learn for ourselves. But the first fact which strikes us is, that the peculiar nature of those works limits very much the amount of direct testimony which they can give. His genuine writings are now generally admitted to be three in number—if indeed they be not two. There are two Apologies[1] (or more probably two parts of one Apology) presented to a heathen emperor; and a Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew. The very nature of the case prevents us from expecting, in such writings, references to the books of the New Testament as inspired authorities. The object of the Apology is to defend Christians from many foul accusations brought against their life and character by the vulgar rumours of Rome. Justin proves that Christians are honourable (c. 12); peace-loving and continent (c. 21); good citizens (c. 17); followers of one whom ancient prophecies foretold (c. 47); that they use a simple ritual (chaps. 65, 67), and practise the most self-denying charity towards one another as brethren, and as under the eye of one God and Maker of all. "We continually remind ourselves of these things, and the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together: and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all, through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost."[2] It is obvious, when we consider the object in the writer's view, that there could be little direct quotation in

[1] The first Apology is addressed to the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar. It probably dates from A.D. 139. Eusebius tells us that he addressed another Apology to Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and that he suffered martyrdom during that emperor's reign. The most certain indications of date we can gather from his writings are allusions to the Jewish war under Barcocheba in A.D. 131-136, of which he speaks as a recent event: see Apol. I. c. 31; Dial. c. 1, c. 9. He alludes to the death of Christ as an event of 150 years before; and refers to Hadrian's decree, Apol. I. 47, Dial. c. 10, banishing the Jews from Jerusalem, and to the deification of Antinous, Apol. I. c. 29, as recent events. The other works ascribed to him—"To Diognetus," see p. 65, two Addresses to Greeks, and "De Monarchia"—are not now considered to be his. Nor is a fragmentary Treatise on the Resurrection to be founded upon, though it may be quoted with reserve.

[2] Compare Lucian's description of the experiences of Peregrinus Proteus.

the "Apology," and that all we can expect is a general agreement in tone and apparent historical basis with our Scriptures. That agreement we have beyond all question. But we have not such appeals to the New Testament as Irenæus and Tertullian make when discussing some point of doctrine; and we have no right to expect them. It is the unvarying characteristic of Christian apologists not to quote the Gospels by the titles in use among Christians. In other works they did so quote the Gospels, but never in their "Apologies" addressed to the heathen. The argument that because Justin does not name our evangelists, he did not know them, would, if applied to others, lead to absurd results. It would prove that Tatian, who never names them in his oration to the Gentiles, did not know them, though we know that he wrote a harmony of the four; that Tertullian, who, in his Apology, never names them, and seldom uses their language, did not know them, though his other writings are a rich mine of distinct quotation; that even Cyprian did not know them, because in his defence of Christianity, addressed to a heathen, he does not name them.[1]

We turn from the Apology to the Dialogue with Trypho, and we find that it turns upon the Scriptures—but it is upon the Old Testament. Justin represents himself as accosted by Trypho one day when he was walking; and in the conversation which ensued, it soon appeared that although Trypho was a student of Greek philosophy, he was also a Jewish fugitive from the recent war of Barcocheba. Trypho, representing the prejudice of his nation, charged all Christians with having accepted a baseless rumour as the foundation of their religion, and with having formed a kind of Christ for themselves, so that they were perishing thoughtlessly. Justin began to defend his creed; and as his opponent and he had one point in common—acceptance of the Old Testament Scriptures—the argument (see chaps. 32, 55, 56, 71) turns upon it. Not that the Christian records were ignored, for Trypho had read them (c. 10), and Justin therefore says that he does not think it absurd to quote the short records of the Saviour's doings along with the prophecies.[2] But Justin uses the Christian books only as historical material for his position, that Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who lived and died and rose again, is the Revealer of the Father and the Saviour of men; and the aim of the Dialogue is to show that the true meaning of the very words of the Prophets and Psalms and Pentateuch is fulfilled in this Christ. It is clear that in an argument of this kind, verbal dependence on the Gospels or Epistles of the New Testament is not to be expected. But it is equally clear that if our sacred books be the records of the truth, as held by the Church of the first days, we shall find in this dialogue that the Christ of whom Justin discoursed so copiously is the same as He of whom our evangelists wrote, and

[1] See Norton on the Gospels, vol. i. p. 137.

[2] Βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου (sc. Σωτῆρος) λογία, c. 18. So, βραχεῖς λόγοι, Apol. I. 14.

whom Paul preached. Now that the Christ to whom Justin gave his soul is the Redeemer whom we worship, we have abundant proof.

Jesus Christ, according to Justin, is the God who manifested Himself unto Israel of old, for no man ever saw the Father who is Lord of all; He is the Word (see Dial. chaps. 146, 147, &c.); the Son of God, who became man (Apol. I. 5); was born of a virgin, sheltered in Egypt, grew up in obscurity until He was 30 years of age, taught, healed, did miracles, was crucified, dead and buried, and the third day rose again; filled His disciples with knowledge, and gave them their commission to teach all nations; was the light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of His people Israel. In short, the incidents of the Saviour's birth, life, death, and rising again, as the incarnate Son of God, are actually stated or unquestionably implied in Justin's writings. His teaching also is beautifully represented (see Dial. 93, and also Apol. I., chaps. 15, 16, 17, 18).

Thus there can be no doubt of the substantial agreement of Justin's Gospel with the Synoptic Gospels; but the question comes to turn upon the form of Justin's citations and references. Can it be that Justin used the first form of the Gospel—*πρῶτον εὐαγγέλιον*—now lost, which was afterwards altered so as to take on, after much labour, the form of our present Gospels?

We shall most succinctly define what we believe to be the true position in the controversy regarding Justin's quotations, by noting these three points.

1. While Justin *based his proof of Christianity on the Old Testament as a whole, he founded especially on Old Testament prophecy.* His most elaborate arguments are expositions of Psalms xxii. (Dial. 98-106), cx. (c. 33), and lxxii. (c. 34). To him almost all the Old Testament is Messianic. His quotations from the Old Testament prophecies are—as it is obviously indispensable that they should be—explicit, accompanied (not always correctly) with the name of the author from whom the quotation is made; and while shorter passages seem to be quoted from memory, the longer are verbally correct. It is noteworthy, also, that the only book of the New Testament which he quotes by name is the only prophetic book—the Apocalypse—from which he cites the passage predicting the millennium.

2. *He alluded to the Gospels as historical documents, though he did not claim for them* (it is not clear how his object in quoting would have been served by doing so) *the same position as for the Old Testament prophecies.* He appeals to them as historical documents under the name of *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*.[1] He describes them as containing "all things which concern our Saviour Jesus Christ"—Apol. II. 75. He says they "were written by the Apostles, and are called

[1] Justin makes it clear, in his more detailed descriptions, that he means "Memoirs *by* the Apostles," not "Memoirs *of*." See below, p. lxi.

Gospels."[1] He says they were read on Sundays to the congregations, along with (and apparently on the same level as) the writings of the prophets, and that oral public teaching of the audience was founded on their contents—Apol. 1, 67. Nay more, in words which remind us of St Luke's Preface,[2] he says, "In the Memoirs which I affirm to have been composed by his Apostles, and those who followed with them, it is written that sweat fell from Him like drops of blood while He was praying, and saying, Let this cup, if it be possible, pass from me"—Dial. c. 103.[3] In these expressions separate works are apparently alluded to: on other occasions the word εὐαγγέλιον[4] seems to be applied in the same general way as by ourselves, to denote the tenor of the written records of Christianity (see Dial. 10, 100). But when Justin is under the necessity of advancing statements of facts which are recorded in the Gospels, he refers to them as the authoritative books of the Christians, lest it should be supposed that he is drawing on his own imagination for his facts.[5]

In thus quoting the "Memoirs," Justin quotes books which were not only accessible but also known to opponents, whether heathen or Jewish. Trypho says he has read them. It is therefore clear that there were in Justin's day certain well-known historical documents whose contents were "The Gospel;" which were themselves called "Gospels;" which were written by Apostles and their companions; and whose characteristics are indicated in Justin's term "Memoirs"—*Memorabilia.* Everything here seems to identify those Memoirs of Justin's with our canonical books. It is true he does not quote them by name in his works which remain; but it would have been cumbersome to do so. His one New Testament quotation, which he accompanies with the name of its author, is so extremely circuitous and circumstantial, as to show why he makes that kind of reference very rarely. "And a certain man among ourselves, whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in the Revelation which was made to him, prophesied that those who believe in our Christ will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem." There is something very suggestive in this circumlocution (Dial. 81).

3. *Justin's position in the history of the Church accounts for the nature and limits of his quotations.* His lifetime stretched across the period

[1] It seems idle to discuss the assertion that this clause is an interpolation. There is no ground for it, save that it is necessary to the theory that Justin's "Memoirs" are not our Gospels. But since the assertion is made, the passage cannot of itself be conclusive proof that Justin used our synoptics.

[2] All the more so, that it occurs in connection with the mention of the sweat which we find in Luke's Gospel.

[3] Thus Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4, 2) says *Apostoli* and *Apostolici* are the authors of the *instrumentum evangelicum.*

[4] The word in its Christian sense would not have been intelligible to a mere Greek reader.

[5] See general references to authorities, p. 59; express citations, p. 62.

which connected the traditions with the written records of the life of Christ; for during it the men whose ears had heard the first oral preaching of Christ's Gospel died out, and it was therefore the time when the indispensable necessity of written Gospels was first clearly seen. We do not assume that he quoted our canonical Gospels; but it is right to notice that if he did use them, it was natural that he should use them freely, not slavishly, and also that he should supplement them with little items derived from traditional or apocryphal sources. To account for his using them freely, let us remember that Justin must have met with many who had heard the first Apostles preach,—hundreds, we may say, who knew John in Ephesus. And in such circumstances, general allusions to the written records, rather than strict verbal quotations from them, are what we may expect.

Nor need we wonder if he so supplements the canonical Gospels as to agree with some apocryphal writers in forms of expression which had come down to him and them by tradition. One or two passages, too trifling to bear much strain, show this amount of agreement with the Clementine Homilies. The text[1] shows that the agreement is accompanied by striking divergences: and the passages themselves are quoted in remarkably various ways by early authors, both orthodox and heretical. One or two other passages contain incidents the same as are recorded in our Gospels, but with additions of no great moment, such as may have come to Justin from apocryphal books or from oral tradition. That Jesus was born in a cave near the village of Bethlehem; that the Magi came from Arabia; that Herod slew all the children of Bethlehem; that Jesus as a carpenter made ploughs and yokes emblems of righteousness; that a fire was kindled on the Jordan at the baptism of Jesus; that the voice from heaven at the baptism said, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; that proofs of Jesus' miracles, and the events of the day of the crucifixion, are to be found recorded in an official register called the Acts of Pilate,—these are the chief, indeed all the important, peculiarities of Justin's evangelical narrative. They are examined in detail in the text;[2] but the general remark may be made here, that with one exception they are not said by Justin to be taken from the Memoirs, or from any other book. That exception (p. 126), moreover, only alleges the authority of the Memoirs for the part of the narrative which is not apocryphal. Even, however, if each and all of them were shown to be quotations of Justin from other than canonical sources,—nay, even if it were shown that all of them, like all Justin's other quotations, came from some one apocryphal book now lost,—to what would it amount? Simply to this, that the book was amazingly like our Gospels; that throughout the whole marvellous history of Christ, its narrative is identical with them in every point of any moment, and that its variations are in

[1] *Vide infra*, p. lxv. note 3.

[2] *Vide infra*, pp. 125-127.

trifles only; that if we had it in our hands, it would (so far as we can judge from those specimens) add less, infinitely less, to the historical incidents than any one of our synoptists does. It is not therefore a competing, a contradictory, or an incompatible book; and its existence—if it were established—would only show how thoroughly consolidated and consistent was the Gospel narrative accepted in the early Church. But farther, as a matter of fact, the existence of any such Gospel in Justin's time cannot be established. That Jesus worked as a carpenter may be inferred from St Mark, and it is of little moment to suppose that Justin's allusion (Dial. c. 88) to the ploughs he made is drawn from the Gospel of Thomas, or from the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy. The Ebionite Gospel contained the tradition of the fire on the Jordan, but we have no proof that it contained the other incidents wherewith Justin supplements the canonical narrative. It may be that the Gospel of the Hebrews contained the saying, "In what things soever I find you, in these also shall I judge you;" but of this we have no proof. But the inference that any one of those books, or some other which contained the materials of them all, was the book which Justin quoted, is not warranted by evidence. It is indeed an assumption; for we know nothing of any one of those books warranting a belief that it was complete enough to be Justin's authority. The best known of them all—the Gospel of the Hebrews—omitted the narrative which forms the first two chapters of St Matthew.[1] It cannot, therefore, have been to it that Justin was indebted.

From what has been stated, and especially from those three general propositions, we therefore conclude that Justin was acquainted with our synoptic narratives; and that he was indebted to oral tradition, or to those apocryphal Gospels which embodied it, for certain supplementary matters which we find in his writings. And this is exactly what we should expect from one writing in the period between the days of oral teaching and those of entire dependence on written evangelic narratives.

The objections which are pressed against this conclusion rest mainly on the name Justin gives to his authority, and on the want of verbal correspondence between his expressions and the words of our canonical Gospels.

The name which Justin uses—"Memoirs"—is not, so far as we know, the title of any book or collection of books used in the early Church. It is not intended to be a title: it is a description, and as such is quite correct.[2]

[1] The Nazarene form omitted the chief parts; the Ebionite the whole.

[2] The argument that Justin must mean one work, not several works, is based on a misconception. Ξενοφῶντος ἀπομνημονεύματα was one book, but its genitive is singular. When we have τῶν ἀποστόλων for the dependent genitive, we may conclude that he means several works. In one place Justin speaks of ἐν τοῖς ἀπ. αὐτοῦ, when the last word seems from the context to mean Peter. And by this phrase, "Peter's

It is true that Justin's quotations from our Gospels are not verbally accurate. But neither are his quotations from the Old Testament. He seems to have been familiar with the Psalms, probably from their use in worship, and usually quotes them correctly. All his long quotations are accurately given, probably because he unrolled his volume to find them; but not so his smaller quotations and incidental allusions. He ascribes in one place (Apol. I. 76) to Zephaniah a passage which is found in Zechariah, and to which he himself in another place gives the correct reference. He speaks of Moses feeding his *uncle's* flock (Apol. I. 95), and says that as the younger Israelites in the wilderness grew, so did their clothes grow with them (Dial. c. 131). In seventeen instances he has repeated the same quotation; and in more than half of them there is a striking want of correspondence, either in the words themselves or in their connection with other words quoted. When he thus deals with the Old Testament, and when he never even quotes his old master Plato *verbatim*,[1] it is unreasonable to expect that he would quote the Christian Books with a verbal carefulness which was unknown to his contemporaries, and foreign from the spirit of the age.

An examination of the passages which follow in the text will show the coincidences between Justin and each of the synoptists. Those from Matthew are most striking in the early history of Jesus, in which the Judæo-Christian Gospels of an apocryphal kind are deficient; the most striking correspondence with Mark is the reference to the bestowal of the name of Boanerges on the sons of Zebedee; the most interesting approach to St Luke is in the fact of the mission of the angel to Mary, and in the language narrating that fact. But there are many others. Opinions may differ as to those coincidences being quotations; but it seems to me that they are such quotations as we might expect if Justin had our Gospels in his hand. He seldom quotes without somewhat altering the language; and it has been observed that his variations from the original are usually in the direction of giving a more classical turn to the originally provincial Hellenistic phraseology. This was probably, in part, an unconscious change; in part also intentional, as commending the Gospel to those for whom he wrote.[2]

The question of Justin's use of John's Gospel is beset with some

Memoirs," he probably describes Mark's Gospel, which early tradition connected with Peter. (See Dial. c. 106, and *infra*, p. 143. Cf. for the tradition, Tert. Cont. Marc. 4, 5, and Papias in Eus. III. 39.) He is referring to the change made by Jesus on Simon's name, and on those of the sons of Zebedee; and the only passage containing it is Mark iii. 17. This citation tells strongly against the conjecture that Justin used a harmony. (See before, p. liv, note 2.)

[1] "He quotes Plato seven times in his Apologies and Dialogues: not one of them is *verbatim*."—Norton.

[2] See reference to Prof. R. Lee's MS paper on this subject in Donaldson's Hist. of Christian Literature, vol. ii. p. 331.

peculiar difficulties. The spiritual Gospel, written, as all tradition tells us, after the other three, is in its nature a supplement to them; and an adversary, whether Jew or Christian, was not likely to be affected in the first instance by arguments from it. Nevertheless, there are passages in Justin's writings so closely resembling John's Gospel as to command attention, and to justify those who regard them as proofs of Justin's acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. The most recent writers are again taking up this position, which, though occupied by Lardner and others, had been abandoned by writers of our own time a few years ago.

Take the curious disquisition on the Logos begotten by God in the beginning (Dial. c. 61) as the medium of revelation in all ages of history, who is not separated from the Father, and who is himself God.[1] Take the statements as to the new birth; as to the Word becoming flesh (Apol. c. 66); the living water, and the celestial habitation. With these it seems impossible to doubt that Justin gives us echoes of the fourth Gospel.

It seems idle to discuss whether Justin knew Paul's Epistles,—idle, because if Justin knew Marcion's work he knew Paul, and we have his own words to show that he had grasped the core of Marcion's speculations. We learn from others that he wrote a book against Marcion, now unfortunately lost. He knew also Valentinus's heresy; and the *integrum instrumentum* of that speculator, to which Tertullian testifies, must have been known to him. The references given in our text show incidental correspondence with Paul rather than quotation: show also reasoning from the same point of view, and this is all that we have reason to expect in the works of Justin which remain. Eusebius tells us that Justin's work on the "Sole Government of God" contained proofs from our Scriptures (ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν γραφῶν), and this also is what we might expect. But to say that Justin did not know Paul's Epistles because he does not explicitly quote them in his Apologies and Dialogues, is based on the assumption that when Justin's primary purpose was to convince a contemporary heathen or Jew, he must also have had the secondary aim of showing how many books he knew, with a view to the critical controversies of the nineteenth century.

In conclusion, it seems as though the controversy about Justin's knowledge of our Gospels could not be much longer prolonged. Justin quotes memoirs written by Apostles and their companions; he calls them Gospels; his words are the words we find in our sacred books; he says they were used in public worship along with the prophets every Sunday; Trypho knew them; they are described as accessible to heathen; Justin's knowledge of Christian truth, whether fact or doctrine, is bounded by their contents, for the little apocryphal items are not worthy of being dwelt upon,—and if these things do not prove

[1] See Drummond in Theol. Rev., April 1877; and text, p. 178.

that Justin was a reader of our Evangelists, it is hard to say what would prove it.

But let us try to suppose that the opposite conclusion is adopted. The position, then, is that Justin used and Trypho read a Gospel which cannot be traced elsewhere or afterwards,—a Gospel different from that which his contemporary Marcion knew and mutilated: a set of books which so marvellously disappeared that Irenæus (who had possibly known Justin, and certainly wrote within 30 years of his death), when he descanted on the four winds, the four quarters of the world, and the four Gospels, knew nothing of them; and that Justin, when he quoted the apocryphal book or books, quoted so strangely that Eusebius, with all his love of gossip and all his historical lore, and many another besides him, never knew that the quotations were not from Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. That is to say, that the Memoirs to which Justin challenged the attention of the Roman emperor, senate, and people, and which were, therefore, well known, had so completely perished from the earth that Irenæus, who was familiar with the affairs of Asia, Rome, and Gaul, appealed to friend and foe to remark how marvellous is God's great providence in giving to Christendom and to humanity the four Gospels—the four, neither more nor less—of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

IX.—CLEMENTINE HOMILIES.

(*See Text, pp.* 438-444.)

The apocryphal writing known as the Clementine Homilies is one of the most original and important of the many passing under the name of Clement. The name of Clement, as the voucher for the fictitious autobiography conveying to us the narrative and the discussions styled *Homilies*, gave early currency to the belief that they were the production of the Bishop of Rome. Accordingly, Sozomen in the fifth century, following Rufinus and Epiphanius earlier, speaks of Clement as the earliest of ecclesiastical historians. The work is rather an ecclesiastical romance with a doctrinal purpose, having St Peter and Simon Magus for its leading characters, and dealing freely with the facts of the Gospel and apostolical histories. It is written in the interests of Judæo-Christianity, and, in the opinion of most critics, belongs to the middle of the second century. There were other forms of this writing.[1]

[1] Uhlhorn, Die Homilien, p. 75.

The most important of these is the Clementine Recognitions. Whether the Homilies or the Recognitions are the earlier, is a question which has been much debated among critics.[1] The weight and variety of authorities are on the side of the Homilies.[2] The Recognitions, moreover, are extant only in the Latin translations of Rufinus; and as their quotations are more or less assimilated to the passages in the Gospels, they are in their present form of little value for the purposes of our inquiry. We shall confine ourselves accordingly to the examination of the Homilies. The value of this writing was partially apprehended by Mosheim, and more fully by Neander, but it owes its prominence as a controversial work to the use which Baur has made of it for his reconstruction of the early history of the Church.[3] Additional literary interest has attached to it since Dressel's discovery of a complete manuscript, with the help of which some questions relating to the use of the Gospels in the Homilies have been set at rest.

The value of the testimony of the Clementine Homilies to the use of the Gospels is somewhat lessened by our want of certainty as to the date of their composition. There are indications of some relationship between them and the writings of Justin Martyr. There is such an amount of similarity between the quotations in the Clementines and in Justin, that Credner investigates the two together, and finds the use of a Petri-Evangelium common to both.[4] However this may be, the phenomena of quotation generally are such as to support the view that the Homilies belong to the middle of the second century. What, then, are the Gospels used at that time, or about that time, within the circle to which the author belongs?

Matthew.—There cannot be a reasonable doubt as to the use of Matthew's Gospel. There are several quotations made from it, word for word, and the passages quoted are in several instances peculiar to Matthew—compare Hom. III. 52 with Mat. xi. 28; Hom. XIX. 7 with Mat. xii. 34; Hom. XIX. 2 with Mat. v. 37. But besides these exact quotations, there is a large number of quotations showing greater or less agreement with St Matthew's Gospel. There is one passage of special interest as evidence of this agreement. In Hom. XVIII. 15, Peter is made to quote against Simon Magus the substance of Ps. lxxviii. 2 (LXX., Ps. lxxvii. 2), assigning it, however, not to Asaph, as the LXX., but to Isaiah. Here are the words in the Homily: Καὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν εἰπεῖν· ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ ἐξερεύξομαι κεκ-

[1] Uhlhorn, p. 16 *et seq.*

[2] Cf. Uhlhorn; Sanday, 'The Gospels in the Second Century,' p. 162. See, above all, Credner's Beiträge, p. 280, for an argument in favour of the priority of the Homilies, which Hilgenfeld in his 'Kritische Untersuchungen,' p. 325, does not overthrow, although he is followed by Ritschl, Volkmar, and Lipsius.

[3] Baur, Die Christliche Gnosis.

[4] Uhlhorn, p. 112 *et seq.*; Credner's Beiträge, vol. i. pp. 330, 331.

ρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. It is remarkable that Matthew has assigned the substance of this quotation to "the prophet,"—whether with or without Ἡσαΐου is a point much discussed among textual critics. Here is the quotation in Matthew: Ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ [Ἡσαΐου] τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου· ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Mat. xiii. 35). In Matthew the Clementine writer may have found the reading with the false ascription, instances of which are not rare—*e.g.*, Mark i. 2; Mat. xxvii. 9; Justin's Dial. c. 28. He certainly did not get his quotation directly from the LXX., else Ἡσαΐαν would be inexplicable. Observe also that his peculiar word ἐξερεύξομαι corresponds mainly with Matthew's ἐρεύξομαι, not with LXX. φθέγξομαι; and his κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is literally Matthew's as against LXX., προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. Such striking resemblances, taken together, furnish evidence for the use of Matthew's Gospel not to be explained away. It is true that many of the passages given (see p. 438) bear only a partial resemblance to the corresponding passages in the Gospels. But when one considers the nature of the writing, one would not be surprised were there even fewer verbal coincidences. The work is a romance, in which the *facts*[1] of the Gospel history are freely handled, and in which the *words* of Jesus, as given by the evangelists, might readily be found mutilated and misquoted. Not to say that the writer certainly treats with much freedom quotations from the Old Testament, except when an argument turning upon a word, or reference to his authority in a long passage,[2] secures a greater approach to exactness,—one can account for difference in form amid substantial agreement by paraphrase in accordance with the plan of the work, or combination of similar passages, or quotations from memory. The discussion carried on by Peter and Simon Magus is so managed as to give occasion for quoting from memory or from hearsay. Deut. xxxiv. 5, quoted in Hom. III. 47, is an illustration of the Homilist's Old Testament references. The verbal variations and omissions point to the use of the Septuagint, and the character of the resemblances speaks for the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew. We may certainly affirm that the writer of the Homilies was accustomed to the use of Matthew's Gospel,—whether in its canonical form, or as the Gospel of the Hebrews, we need not meanwhile inquire. But it is needful to say in passing that the theory which assumes Justin Martyr and the author of the Homilies to have quoted the same non-canonical authority (whether it were the Gospel of the Hebrews, or the Ebionite Gospel, or the Gospel of Peter) cannot survive an actual comparison of the passages quoted by both. That comparison shows as great difference between the two as between Justin and the canonical writings.[3]

[1] See Hom. IV. 1; Hom. XVII. 19, &c.

[2] Cf. *supra* under "Justin."

[3] Compare Hom. VIII. 21 with Dial. cc. 125, 103; Hom. III. 55, XIX. 2, with

Luke.—The use of Luke's Gospel is also apparent, although the evidence comes more from allusions than from exact quotation. There are no quotations altogether verbatim. But Christ's prayer for His crucifiers (Hom. XI. 20); the emphatic repetition of the injunction to fear God, and the lesson of patient waiting for God's answer to prayer taught by the parable of the unjust judge (Hom. XVII. 5); the story of Zacchæus (Hom. III. 63); the fall of the wicked one as lightning (Hom. XIX. 2); names written in heaven (Hom. IX. 22),—are introduced with such directness as to point to the use of the third Gospel. When Hilgenfeld[1] says that the Clementine writer was *perhaps* acquainted with Luke's Gospel, he fails to do justice to the evidence.[2] We may with considerable confidence conclude, alike from the allusions themselves and from the Lucan character they bear when reproduced in the Homilies, that the use of Luke's Gospel is reasonably made out.

One feature of the Lucan references is the way in which they are mixed up with passages of Matthew's Gospel. See, for example, Hom. III. 56, where Mat. vii. 9-11 and Luke xi. 11-13 seem to be both in the Homilist's mind, and to be alternately drawn upon; Hom. XVII. 5, which combines Mat. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4, 5; and Hom. III. 60, where both Mat. xxiv. 45-51 and Luke xii. 42-45 are used. The phenomena of this double resemblance are such, according to Sanday,[3] as to exclude an earlier document underlying our synoptics, and employed by the Clementine writer. They seem to indicate either alternate quotations from Matthew and Luke, with occasional expansions or omissions, or the use of a harmony made at a later time.

Mark.—It is only since Dressel's discovery of the concluding portion of the Homilies in a Greek MS that the use of Mark has been definitely ascertained. There are in the earlier portions of the Homilies allusions to the Gospel history pointing with a measure of probability to the use of Mark. The reference to the Syrophœnician woman (Hom. II. 19) gives Σύρα Φοινίκισσα (Mark vii. 26); the summons, ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ, Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου Κύριος εἷς ἐστιν (Hom. III. 57), seems to be from Mark (xii. 29); and Mark xii. 27 (Mat. xxii. 32), οὐκ ἔστιν Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων, is found exactly reproduced in Hom. III. 55. The decisive allusion is Hom. XIX. 20, where Mark iv. 34 is evidently in the eye of the Homilist. The Homilist says, διὸ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπέλυε τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια, which exhibits striking agreement with Mark's κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπέλυε πάντα.

Apol. I. 16; Hom. III. 57 with Dial. c. 96 (cf. Apol. I. 15); Hom. III. 55, Apol. I. 15; Hom. XI. 35, Apol. I. 16; Hom. VIII. 4, Dial. c. 76; Hom. XVIII. 5, Apol. I. 19; Hom. XVIII. 4, Apol. I. 63; Hom. XVIII. 3, Dial. c. 101; Hom. XV. 5, Apol. I. 16; Hom. XIX. 2, Dial. c. 76; Hom. III. 18, Dial. c. 17; Hom. XI. 26, Apol. I. 61. See Westcott, Canon, 4th ed., p. 286, from whom this list is taken.

[1] Krit. Unters., p. 388.

[2] Uhlhorn, p. 121.

[3] P. 185.

The verb ἐπιλύω is used only once again in the New Testament, Acts xix. 39, and the noun ἐπιλυσις appears in 2 Peter i. 20. It is difficult to explain away the force of this coincidence, and we may regard it as raising to the highest degree of probability what was probable in a lower degree before Dressel's discovery,—the use of our second Gospel by the Clementine writer.

John.—The discovery which has helped us to such a degree of certainty as regards the use of Mark, has largely increased the evidence for the use of John. The slight allusions to the necessity of regeneration (Hom. XI. 26), and to Christ's words, "I am the door of the sheep," "My sheep hear my voice" (Hom. III. 52), and the still more slight allusion to our Lord's language in John viii. 44 (Hom. III. 25), were, previous to Dressel's discovery, barely sufficient to raise the use of the fourth Gospel to the highest degree of probability. That evidence is now supplemented by a direct and striking allusion to the man blind from his birth (John ix. 1). The quotation of the disciple and the answer of Jesus are quoted (Hom. XIX. 22) with slight variation and expansion. The expression ἐκ γενετῆς is common to John and the Homilist; εἰ οὗτος ἥμαρτεν ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, corresponds to τίς ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ of the Evangelist; and ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ φανερωθῇ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἰωμένη τὰ ἁμαρτήματα is just such a variation of ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ as was required by the Homilist's argument as to sins of ignorance in the context. Taken in connection with slighter allusions, this allusion goes far to set the question of the use of John's Gospel by the Clementine writer finally at rest.

Apocryphal Gospel?—There are in the Clementine Homilies, as in Justin, sayings attributed to Christ, and not to be found in our Gospels (Hom. III. 50, 55; XIX. 20; and perhaps XII. 2). Credner[1] refers these sayings to an apocryphal Gospel, which he takes to be the *Gospel of Peter*. Hilgenfeld[2] thinks that Justin and the Clementine writer used one and the same apocryphal Gospel. Uhlhorn's[3] conclusion is, that the use of an uncanonical Gospel document is proved, and that the document is of a secondary character, probably from the stock of the Gospel of the Hebrews. We can only say, as we have said of the apocryphal allusions in Justin, that the Homilist may have got his supplementary sayings and details from oral tradition, or from those apocryphal Gospels which contained it. The character of the writing gave scope for the introduction of such traditional sayings of Jesus as might still be passing from mouth to mouth, and the time of its composition was in all probability the time when Christians were still partly dependent for acquaintance with the life and words of Jesus upon oral teaching, and not yet entirely dependent upon written narratives.

[1] Beiträge, I. p. 331. [2] Krit. Unters., p. 388. [3] Die Homilien, p. 137.

Acts of the Apostles.—The Homilist (Hom. III. 53) puts into the mouth of Jesus a claim to be the personal fulfilment of Deut. xviii. 15,—a claim which Peter makes for Him, Acts iii. 22, and Stephen, Acts vii. 37. It is doubtful whether this can be taken as a reference to the book of Acts at all. It may be (as Credner suggests) based upon John v. 46.

Paul's Epistles.—There are two passages in which there are apparent allusions to Pauline Epistles,—Hom. XIX. 22 pointing to Gal. iv. 10; Hom. XIX. 2 pointing to Eph. iv. 27. But the allusions are so indefinite as not to disturb the received opinion that the Clementine Homilies contain no references whatever to the Pauline Epistles. Indeed, the nature of the writing is such as to exclude them. The writer is a Judæo-Christian opposed to Paul; and Simon Magus, whom he introduces as Peter's opponent, is the Apostle of the Gentiles in disguise.

X.—GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS.

(*See Text, pp.* 451-463.)

Among the many problems of which we can only find a provisional or probable solution, that of the Gospel of the Hebrews is undoubtedly one. Of late years, critics of the negative school have raised this book to a position of primary importance, as the fountain from which all our Gospels flow. Hilgenfeld calls it the Archimedes-point which scholars so long sought in the Gospel of Mark.[1] But before we can so honour it, we should need to know more about its characteristics and its history. Its structure is a hypothesis, and any theory as to its origin very nearly the same.

The facts on which we have to exercise judgment are not many. Complications arise from the apparent inconsistency of Jerome's statements with one another, and from the discrepancies between what is quoted by him and what is quoted by Epiphanius as the account of the Baptism in the Hebrew Gospel.[2]

It is, however, an admitted fact that several books more or less akin to St Matthew's Gospel—or one book resembling that Gospel—circulated largely among several sects of Jewish Christians in the early centuries. How early those books (or that book) existed, and how

[1] Nov. Test. ex. Can. Rec., p. 13.

[2] See and compare in the text Jerome and Epiphanius on Mat. iii. 14, &c.

much change the copies underwent in the course of years, are matters of dispute. It is easy to show that at the time when we hear most of them by name, those books or copies did not agree with each other, and that each one contained support for the special views of the sect that used it. (See below on the Gospels of the Nazarenes, Ebionites, and Egyptians. See in the text a note on the Gospel of Peter, which may have been another recension of it.)

It is impossible to sketch even the outlines of the problem without taking a hasty view of the sects among which the "Gospel of the Hebrews" was found. The chief of these were the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. A few words will indicate their characteristics.

The Nazarenes diverged least in doctrine from the ordinary catholic type, of which Hegesippus speaks so strongly.[1] The name was originally applied by the Jews to all Christians. Whatever the origin of the word Nazarene,[2]—whatever the difference in meaning between Nazarene and Nazarite, Nazirite and Nazorite, in early usage,—we may accept as a fact that a sect of Christians did claim from an early date down to the fifth century to be followers of Christ in special affinity with "James the Just," of whose character and death Eusebius has preserved from Hegesippus so graphic an account.[3] This very claim of theirs intimates that, like James, they were consecrated to follow Jesus as the Messiah; and, like James, combined Christianity with observance of many of the practices of Judaism. James, with all his reverence for Judaism, was essentially a Christian, and for his avowal of his Christian faith lost his life. The Nazarenes, in short, were Hebrew Christians, with strong abiding national peculiarities of faith and ritual. They were chiefly found by the banks of the Jordan, in Gilead and Bashan, and northwards towards Syria. They were not "heretics;" and there is no proof that they rejected all the New Testament save a Gospel of their own.[4] They did not reject St Paul as an apostate, and in this they differed from most of the Jewish sects.[5] Indeed, while they clung to many points of Judaism, they do not seem to have sought to impose the doctrine or practice of the Law on other Christians.

The Ebionites originally were the Jewish Christians. As time went on they became a sect, and, as Jerome says, were half Jew, half Chris-

[1] See Introduction on Hegesippus.

[2] From נֵצֶר, a shoot or sprout, or from נָזִיר, devoted or dedicated. See Kleuker, Die Apokryphen, p. 928, &c.; 118, 133; Fabricius, Cod. Apoc., p. 370.

[3] Both Hegesippus and Eusebius say that James was consecrated.

[4] The passages from Epiph. Haer. 29, 7-9, &c. (see text and notes, p. 456), do not necessarily mean this; and even though they did, would not settle the matter, as Epiphanius apparently never saw the Nazarene book.

[5] The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which is supposed to be an utterance of this sect, contains under the head of "Benjamin" a prediction of St Paul, as one "who is to arise beloved of the Lord, listening to His voice, enlightening all the Gentiles with new knowledge." See text, p. 446.

tian. Some say they were called after a founder, Ebion; others that their name means "poor," and that they were the descendants of the impoverished Church of Jerusalem; others that they bore the name of "The Poor Men," because their intellect or their views were low (Eus. H. E. III. 27). That the name was originally given to all Jewish Christians is seen in Eus. Onomasticon, *sub voce* χωβά, where we read "χωβά . . . ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶν Ἑβραῖοι οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντες Ἐβιωναῖοι καλούμενοι." (See Lipsius, Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanios, p. 123.) They recognised Christ as the Messiah, but refused to own His divinity; they rejected St Paul as an apostate; and they clung to what they called the Gospel of the Hebrews. The earlier Ebionites regarded Christ as a mere man; the later introduced the Gnostic idea of an Æon coming down on Jesus at His baptism. The Ebionitism of which we read in the earlier Fathers, as Irenæus and Hippolytus, was of the first or Pharisaic form; that of which Epiphanius tells is the second or Essenic form.[1] Their headquarters were by the banks of the Jordan.

It would be absurd to suppose that all of them were of one type, but they were substantially as described above.

Both Nazarenes and Ebionites used the Gospel of the Hebrews. There can be no surprise in finding that this book resembled St Matthew more than the other canonical Gospels. St Matthew's Gospel in its whole structure, and especially in its avowed relation to Old Testament prophecy and Old Testament types, was intended primarily for Hebrew Christians. There is, moreover, a widespread tradition in the Church, to which many Fathers bear witness, that Matthew's book was originally written in Hebrew.[2] It is a natural supposition that the sects of Hebrew Christians would preserve the original text of Matthew's Gospel in their native tongue. The book, however, as they had it, is lost—we may say, hopelessly lost; and we have only citations from it, and descriptions of it by the early Fathers, to depend upon. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and above all Jerome, expressly quote from it.[3] Nay, Jerome, famous for his industry and his learning, says, "There is a Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I lately translated from the Hebrew tongue into Greek, and which is called by many the authentic Gospel of Matthew" (Comment. in Mat. xii. 3[4]). From this there can be no doubt that it was a book which differed so considerably from our canonical book as to need translation, and to awaken controversy whether its form was the original one.

[1] See Epiphanius, Haer. 30, 3. Epiphanius is the first to distinguish Ebionites from Nazarenes as heretical sects.

[2] See Irenæus in Possini Catena Patrum, text, p. 129. Origen, Comment. in Joann., tom. iv. p. 132. Eus. H. E. III. 24; V. 10. Cyril Hieros. Catech., p. 148.

[3] See text, p. 451, for references under "Gospel of the Hebrews:" see on Origen's quotations, p. 137, note 2.

[4] See on this, Baur's Evangelien, p. 475; Roberts on the Gospels, p. 399.

In another passage (written A.D. 392) he says: "Matthew, called also Levi, who from a publican became an Apostle, first of all composed the Gospel of Christ in *Hebrew letters and words*, in Judæa, for behoof of those of the circumcision who had believed; and it is not quite certain who afterwards translated it into Greek. But the very Hebrew is preserved to this day, in the Cæsarean Library, which Pamphilus the martyr with such care collected. I myself also was allowed the opportunity of copying it [seeing and examining it?] by the Nazarenes in Berœa, who use this volume. In which it is to be observed that throughout the Evangelist, when he uses the testimonies of the Old Testament, either in his own person or in that of the Lord and Saviour, does not follow the authority of the LXX. translators, but the Hebrew. Of those the following are two examples: 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son'—ii. 15; and, 'Since He shall be called a Nazarene'—iii. 23."[1]

That this is another book from that of which we have read in the passage formerly quoted, is clear. The other he translated; this one he has seen and examined (for this is all we are entitled to make of "facultas describendi fuit"). The other was a competitor with our St Matthew for the honour of being the original; this one is our St Matthew itself in its primary form in Hebrew. The former he had thought it worth while to translate; in the case of this one, he only needed to compare it with our canonical book, so as to see that the quotations which it makes from the Old Testament are from the original Old Testament Hebrew, and do not correspond with the Greek of the LXX.

All this seems clear enough. But unfortunately Jerome is not always so distinct; and it appears that in his old age he virtually, if not explicitly, retracted the somewhat hasty opinion he had given, that the book which the Nazarenes in Berœa used, and which was identical with the original in Cæsarea, was the very Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew. Born A.D. 331, he died A.D. 420, at the age of 91, studying and writing almost to the last, Hebrew being the study of his old age. It was in A.D. 392 that he said the Nazarenes of Berœa had the genuine original; in later times, A.D. 410 to A.D. 415, he is more indefinite; and his last utterance on the subject, four or five years before his death, is founded upon as a virtual retractation.[2] His words are: "In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which was written indeed in the Chaldee-Syriac language, but in Hebrew characters, which the Nazarenes use as the *Gospel according to the Apostles*, or as the majority think *according to Matthew*, which also is contained in the Library at Cæsarea, the narrative says," &c. He quotes from it some passages which are not in our canonical Gospel. He also says, "That Gospel which is called the Gospel of the Hebrews, which was lately translated by me into Greek and Latin, and was used frequently by Origen."

[1] De Vir. Ill., c. 3. See text, p. 139.
[2] See Roberts, Discussions on the Gospels, p. 401, &c.

There can be no doubt that difficulty arises from the fact that the book which Jerome believed to be the very original of our St Matthew was used by the Nazarenes in Berœa: while he speaks elsewhere as though the other book (differing so much from our St Matthew that he translated it) was used by all the Nazarenes, as well as by the Ebionites, —in short, that it was distinctive of those sects to use it. And it is possible that, in his mature judgment, he meant to intimate that the book which the Nazarenes used was not the original Matthew. But we must remember, on the other hand, that the Nazarenes did not all necessarily use the same book. Those of Berœa[1] may, like their Macedonian namesakes, have been honourably distinguished for inquiring into Scripture, and so have retained a genuine copy, while the Nazarenes further south by the banks of the Jordan may have had only an adulterated one. And if we suppose that the Nazarenes did not all use the same book, though all of them used a version of St Matthew more or less like that we have, and written in Hebrew, or in a language which may be popularly described as Hebrew, Jerome is not inconsistent with himself in this part of the subject.

This supposition seems to meet the difficulties of the case so far.

To pursue the inquiry further would lead us into more remote questions as to the original language of our canonical St Matthew. It seems enough to say that the original existence of that book in Hebrew, its translation into Greek by some one unknown, and the ultimate disappearance of the genuine original, are all possible enough separately or together, and are really quite distinct from the matter of fact as to what we learn of the composition of the Gospel of the Hebrews when we first find it in trustworthy quotations. What we thus learn enables us to see clearly that no critical Archimedes can find a firm fulcrum in so shifting a substance. It rushes to and fro like quicksilver. For, when we turn to the book which Nazarenes and Ebionites are supposed to have used, we find that the Nazarene form cannot have been the same as the Ebionite. When we try to lay hold of the book which Jerome translated—as generally used by the Nazarenes—we find (as we might expect) that its narratives are not identical with those of our canonical Gospel, and that its form does not seem to be the original which the other corrupts. When, therefore, Jerome tells us that Nazarenes and Ebionites used that book, and that many thought it the genuine St Matthew, he says what we cannot accept as a literally accurate statement.

When we turn to the quotations in other Fathers—quotations probably containing the more notable and quotable portions—we find them for the most part of small doctrinal importance, and not adding much to our knowledge of facts, but nevertheless interesting, and quite unlike the useless dilutions of the "Apocryphal Gospels."

[1] A town in Syria—perhaps Aleppo.

The words, "I am not a bodiless phantom," ascribed to our Lord, are not very different from those in the New Testament. These others, "He that hath wondered shall rule, and he that hath ruled shall have rest," contain Christian philosophy in Gnostic phrase. And others might be similarly used as illustrations.

We have ordinary traditional variation in the rich man "scratching his head;"[1] we have also an interesting traditional application of our Lord's words, when the rich man in the narrative already alluded to is asked how he can be said to love his neighbour—for while his house is full of good things, nothing goes out from it to relieve the squalor and the hunger and the poverty among the children of Abraham around his door.

But we have distinct doctrinal purpose, obviously of a Gnostic type, in a number of other passages peculiar to this Gospel. We read that the reply of Jesus to His mother and brethren, when they pressed Him to go with them to be baptised of John unto the remission of sins, was, "What sin have I done that I should go and be baptised of Him? Unless it be that this very thing which I have said is ignorance." In this we have an obvious attempt to account for our Lord accepting baptism at the hands of His forerunner without applying the simpler and grander teaching of the canonical narrative, that "thus it became Him to fulfil all righteousness." We see the same Gnostic tendencies at work in the sequel of the Nazarene narrative of the baptism: "When the Lord had gone up out of the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended upon Him, and rested on Him, and said to Him, 'My Son, in all the prophets I waited for Thy coming, that I might rest in Thee: for Thou art my rest: Thou art my first-born Son, who reignest for ever.'" This must be taken in connection with the passages in which the Holy Spirit is called the Mother of Jesus,—passages which startled both Origen and Jerome in their day; and, as we have seen in the notes to our text, led on from the early heresies of the Gnostics into the Mariolatry of the later Christian Church.

We have on the other hand an interesting addition to the Canonical narrative, and a probable explanation of a passage of St Paul, when we find in this Gospel the story of our Lord's appearance to James the Just after His resurrection.

It is scarcely possible that any one who reads the passages preserved from this long-lost Gospel will believe that they are an earlier form of sacred narrative than the canonical St Matthew. They have every mark of being a gradually altered recension of the original work which is in the New Testament.

[1] Also in the man with a withered hand saying that he was a mason; and in the statement that a lintel of prodigious size fell in, instead of the canonical narrative that the veil of the temple was rent; and in the well-known addition to the narrative of the baptism, that fire blazed on the Jordan.

The Ebionite Gospel.

As we have seen, Jerome seems to have thought that the Nazarenes and Ebionites used the same book. His quotations are from the Nazarene form. Epiphanius, not nearly so trustworthy in matters of opinion, but worthy of credit in such matters of fact as long verbal quotations, uses the Ebionite form. We have, therefore, no means of comparing the two sets of quotations, save where they chance to describe the same event. The one being in Latin and the other in Greek, verbal correspondence is scarcely ascertainable; but still we are able to see that, in such a case as the narrative of the baptism of Jesus, the two books cannot have been the same. I have already quoted the Nazarene narrative, and it is enough here to refer for comparison to the long Ebionite extract at p. 457 of our text. The variations are not greater than those found in different manuscripts of such apocryphal books as the Gospel of the Infancy, but they are inconsistent with the theory that we now possess (or can be sure that any one ever possessed) in the Gospel of the Hebrews the original record of the life of Jesus Christ.

In the text will be found a remarkable passage from Epiphanius, intimating that the Gospel used by the Ebionites professed to be written by the twelve apostles in a body, although the names of only eight are given.

Without further detail we may say that the passages from Epiphanius, if they are accepted, are to the effect that—

1. Matthew's Gospel was in use among the Ebionites,[1] but mutilated by the excision of the genealogies, and of the first two chapters as a whole.[2]

2. The Ebionites said that Jesus Christ was not God's Son, but as one of the Archangels, though the chief of them. They supposed that "Christ" came at baptism upon the man Jesus: and they believed Him a Saviour, to be not mere man, but to have had no father or mother or brethren, in the ordinary sense. They quoted, "These are my brethren, and my mother, who do the will of my Father."

3. Although Jews, they ceased to offer sacrifice;[3] they practised circumcision as being from the patriarchs, and as being sanctioned by Christ's example.

[1] See Irenæus, B. I. 26, 2, and B. III. 12, 7.

[2] Epiphanius, Hær. 30, 13 (comp. 29, 9).

[3] In support of this they quoted as words of Jesus, "I came to abolish sacrifices; and if ye do not cease to sacrifice, wrath will not cease from you."

Conclusions as to the Gospel of the Hebrews.

In conclusion, we have had ample proof that some book, professing to be a consecutive account of our Lord's life, was widely circulated among the Jewish Christians, and that this book resembled the canonical St Matthew. We find that it had various names,—that it was the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Nazarene Gospel, the Ebionite Gospel, when described by the name of those who used it; that it was the Gospel of the Twelve, the original St Matthew, when its name was drawn from something in itself.

If we are asked where we have the original form of this book, in the few cases where we can compare different quotations, we must answer that we cannot tell. Its various forms differ considerably from each other, but we have not the means of deciding as to its earliest form. When we have sects so like and yet so unlike as were the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, we might expect that they would adopt the same book at first, and afterwards (probably gradually) modify it to suit themselves. The Ebionite alterations are mainly dogmatical or doctrinal; the Nazarene are chiefly, though not entirely, traditional supplements to the canonical narratives.

We have already found reason to accept the substantial accuracy of Jerome's words, and have come to the conclusion that the book for which *describendi facultas* was granted to him by the Nazarenes of Berœa was not the same as that which he translated;—that the former was our St Matthew in Hebrew; that the latter was St Matthew, adulterated during successive generations. We believe it to be probable that the Berœan book was only used by a portion of the sect of the Nazarenes, and the other by the Nazarenes and the Ebionites as a whole.

Whether Jerome was right in supposing that the book he saw in Berœa was a Hebrew form of St Matthew, and that the book in the Cæsarean Library was another of the same, there can be no good reason for doubting that he who spent his learned old age in Bethlehem knew very well whether the book he translated was substantially the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and the Ebionites in his neighbourhood. There is no reason, from anything that he has said, to regard that book as a serious competitor for the honour of priority with our canonical Gospel.

But a word may now be said here as to its relation to the original form of St Matthew. The conclusion to which I at present incline is only given as the most probable, not as certain. Without entering on the vexed question of the original language of St Matthew, I must say that the current of antiquity runs strongly in favour of its having been Hebrew. But if this were proved to be a mistake of the ancients,[1] the book itself would show that it was at least

[1] See Roberts's Discussions, p. 396.

written for the Hebrews; and therefore we must believe that a Hebrew translation of the Gospel was made at a very early period for the benefit of those who were ignorant of the original Greek, or whose national susceptibilities led them to prefer their national tongue. In any case, we conclude that there was almost at the first a Hebrew form of St Matthew's Gospel. This was naturally the book favoured by Jewish Christians, whether orthodox or heretical; and this, therefore, became the standard of the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. The former, though cherishing it as specially their own, nevertheless gradually introduced into it, perhaps from the margin, such supplementary traditions as that the man whose hand was withered had been a mason. The latter, gradually drawing more apart from other communities, whether Jewish or Christian, continued to adapt their Gospel to their changing tenets, introducing such sayings as that which abolished sacrifice, or such narratives as that which gave the sanction of the Lord and all His apostles to their book.

The Gospel of the Egyptians (*see p.* 468)

was full of parables, allegories, and mysticism, and may be here mentioned because of the agreement of its views with those of another Hebrew sect or organisation, the Essenes. Its title denotes that it was current among the Egyptians, and its mystic teachings confirm the claim of the title. It is not mentioned by Eusebius in his Eccl. Hist., nor is it in the decree of Gelasius. It is mentioned by Origen.[1] It is used also by the author of the so-called "Second Epistle of Clement," and by Clement of Alexandria, but in his case so as to distinguish it from the four Gospels handed down to us.

It is written with the manifest aim of maintaining the merit of celibacy, and of showing the evils wrought in the world by the female sex. In this respect the book corresponds to the tenets of the Essenes; and if there were Essenic Christians with a special "Gospel," this book would exactly meet their case. There is difficulty, however, in connecting the Essenes with the locality of Egypt. It is probable that they adopted some of the philosophy of Egyptian Judaism (see Geikie's 'Life of Christ,' i. 363), but their views of the material universe, and their central doctrines generally, were Zoroastrian (Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 149), and as an organisation they were found by the shores of the Dead Sea. They are not likely to have had local connection with the "Gospel of the Egyptians." Eusebius (H. E. II. 17) identifies the Therapeutæ of Egypt with early Christians, but his argument (which is a commentary upon Philo De Vit. Contempl.) is not now generally

[1] As an attempt of the kind mentioned in St Luke's preface, and as therefore distinguished from the four Gospels, which their authors did not *attempt* to take in hand to make, but which were the result of their being moved by the Holy Ghost. See p. 82.

accepted. Many writers, founding on Philo and Josephus (Bell. Jud. II. 8), identify the Essenes with Christian monks originating in Egypt. This opinion also is not now accepted; but is still not unworthy of consideration. About the Essenes there is little certain. They were originally Jews; and though many of them became Christians after the fall of Jerusalem, they would by so doing cease to be Essenes. That such men would relish, perhaps fabricate, the mystic Gospel is highly probable. But we cannot go further. We may say that the tendency to asceticism which originated the Therapeutæ in Egypt, and the Essenes in Syria, acted upon Christendom also;[1] and that it was to be expected that Egypt, the cradle of Christian monasticism, should give a name to the new "Gospel."

XI.—HEGESIPPUS.

Lightfoot's essay on the silence of Eusebius ('Contemporary Review,' 1875, p. 169) is one of the most important contributions to historical criticism which have been made in our generation. In the case of Hegesippus it has special value, and enables us to understand clearly what formerly was not only obscure but inconsistent with itself. Eusebius, from whom we have almost all we know of him, says that he quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and yet in the pages of Eusebius himself are indirect proofs that his quotations were not limited to it. This seemed contradictory, and certainly led many critics into contradictions of fact. But we now learn from Lightfoot's careful and conclusive induction that Eusebius only laid himself out to record or refer to the quotations of ancient authors when the book from which they quoted was one in dispute, and that his silence upon the subject of citations from a particular book is an indication that the book was not disputed. When therefore the author of 'Supernatural Religion' says of Eus. H. E. IV. 22, that "Eusebius shows that he has sought, and here details, all the sources from which Hegesippus quotes, or regarding which he expresses opinions,"[2] the statement is the reverse of fact, though not unnatural up to the time of Lightfoot's remarkable essay. That the ancient historian enriched his pages with passages from the Gospel of the Hebrews and from unwritten Jewish tradition, is quite compatible with his habitually using the canonical books.

The position of Hegesippus in our inquiry is no longer difficult to

[1] See Ellicott, Cambridge Essays, 1856, p. 169; Nicholson's Gospel of the Hebrews.

[2] Sup. Rel., vol. i. p. 433.

define; and although his testimony is neither full nor explicit, it is quite in accordance with what we have learned from other witnesses. He was in Rome some time between A.D. 157 and A.D. 168, and his history did not leave his hands until after A.D. 177.[1] He was renowned as a champion of Christianity against its assailants,—to be counted indeed among the foremost, as Eusebius tells us, after a most eloquent chapter on the triumphs of the Gospel over heathenism and heresy and false philosophy.[2] Among his writings was a faithful history of the apostolic teaching (*ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος*), unfortunately lost, save that some fragments are preserved by Eusebius. He travelled in many lands, had intercourse with many bishops, and found everywhere the same doctrine in the Church of Christ—a doctrine proclaimed by "the law and the prophets and the Lord."[3] He stayed for some time at Corinth; and there is significance in his avowal that the Church of Corinth continued in the true faith, and that he and the Church in that place were refreshed with each other's sound doctrine. It is strange that any one can write of this Hegesippus as holding only by Hebrew Scriptures and Hebræo-Christian Gospels, when his own distinct statement is that the one doctrine which he found everywhere was specially refreshing to him in the Church of Corinth, which is well known to have been so Pauline. It is not correct to say that Eusebius says, "The Gospel which he used in his writings was that 'according to the Hebrews;'"[4] because Eusebius only says that in his many writings this ancient historian took certain things (*τινὰ τίθησιν*) from the Hebrew and Syriac Gospel (or Gospels), and from Hebrew tradition, as it was natural for one born a Jew to do.[5] And it is worthy of notice, also, that he was no indiscriminate admirer of extra-canonical books, for he took pains to decide upon the claims of the apocryphal writings, and records his conclusion that some of them were forged in his own time by heretics.

[1] He says he was in Rome while Anicetus was bishop; and he intimates that Eleutheros was bishop when he closes his record. Anicetus succeeded in A.D. 157, and Eleutheros in A.D. 177. The Alexandrian Chronicle says he died in the time of Commodus (who began to reign A.D. 192).

[2] Eusebius (H. E. IV. 7, 8, and again IV. 22) names him in the same list with Dionysius of Corinth and Irenæus, as the chief of those to whom we owe it that the orthodoxy of the sound faith which comes from the Apostles has been transmitted in writing ("*ὧν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἡ τῆς ὑγιοῦς πίστεως ἔγγραφος κατῆλθεν ὀρθοδοξία*").

[3] Eus. H. E. IV. 22. He says: "'*Εν ἑκάστῃ δὲ διαδοχῇ, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύττει καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος.*"

[4] Sup. Rel., vol. i. p. 433. In another passage (vol. i. p. 421) the author makes still bolder assertions regarding Hegesippus. "The evidence of this 'ancient and apostolic man' is very important; and although he evidently attaches great value to tradition, knew of no canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, and, like Justin, rejected the Apostle Paul, he still regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews with respect, and made use of no other."

[5] In this same connection Eusebius says Hegesippus put a high value on the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon.

The passages in which the fragments of Hegesippus's writings suggest canonical books will be found in our text. We need only say here that he alludes to Herod's terror at Christ's birth, which is found in Mat. ii., and (as we learn from Epiphanius, Hær. 30, 13) this chapter of Matthew was one of those omitted in the Gospel of the Hebrews. In his memorable description of the death of the strange ascetic, James the Just (Eus. H. E. II. 23), we find an echo of Mat. xxvi. 64,[1] when he speaks of the Son of man on the right hand of the mighty power, and about to come on the clouds of heaven. We find the very words of our Lord's prayer on the cross (Luke xxiii. 34) in the last cry of James, "Father, forgive them (ἄφες αὐτοῖς), for they know not what they do." If later chroniclers report him rightly, he objects to Gnostic renderings of "Eye hath not seen," &c., and cites the words of our Lord, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see," &c. (Mat. xiii. 16; Luke x. 23); and not only so, but refers to our Gospels as *θεῖαι γραφαί*.[2]

It may even be that he alludes to John's Gospel, when, in his account of James's death, he says the crowd asked the saint what is the door of Jesus.[3] He seems to allude to Luke xix. 11 when recording Domitian's inquiry regarding Christ's kingdom; and to 2 Tim. iv. 1 when he gives the answer that Christ would come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and render unto every man according to his works.[4] He weaves the words of the pastoral epistles into his narrative when speaking of the way in which heretics dared to hold up their heads after the Apostles passed away. See Eus. H. E. III. 32.[5]

XII.—MURATORIAN CANON.

Muratori, in the third vol. of 'Antiquitates Italicæ Medii Ævi' (1740), published a MS, at that time in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, formerly in the monastery of Bobbio. His object was to show that some men employed in old times to copy MSS were singularly unlearned and unskilled; but he was also aware that the MS was valuable because of its connection with the canon of the New Testament. The MS contained various fragments. It seems to have been the common-

1 Cf. Mat. chiefly; but see also Mark and Luke.

2 His words, "From these arose false Christs, false prophets, false apostles," resemble Mat. xxiv. 24 more than the Clementine version. See p. 125, note 1.

3 Eus. H. E. II. 23. The answer is, that "He was the Saviour."

4 Eus. H. E. III. 19, 20.

5 It is not certain that Eusebius uses the very words of Hegesippus, but we may suppose that the statement is reported pretty much as he made it.

place-book of a monk, apparently of the eighth century. Muratori's own conjecture (generally approved by subsequent writers) was, "*cujus antiquitas pœne ad annos mille accedere mihi visa est.*" [1]

Amongst other things in the MS was a fragment on the canon beginning in the middle of a sentence, and breaking off abruptly. From the reference to Hermas as "having written the 'Shepherd' very recently and in our own times, while Pius, his brother, was bishop of Rome," Muratori supposed Caius, a well-known presbyter of Rome, to be the author of this fragment on the canon, and fixed the date at A.D. 196. As regards the date, this is a mistake, for Pius died about the middle of the second century. If the words "very recently and in our own times" be true, and have their natural meaning, the date of the original of the fragment is probably A.D. 160 or 170. Internal evidence seems on the whole to confirm this conclusion. There is nothing to identify the author. But the testimony is valuable as being early. It is evidently a very illiterate transcript, and the transcriber appears to have had before him a badly done translation of a Greek account of the canon.[2] The conjectures and controversies of scholars may be summed up in the words of Tregelles, whose careful edition is the basis of the text in this work: "Its evidence is not the less trustworthy from its being a blundering and illiterate transcript of a rough and rustic translation of a Greek original." [3]

But while admitting this, we may be permitted to wonder at the unanimity with which so many scholars of all shades of opinion accept this anonymous fragment as genuine, though there is little warrant for its date save its own claim, and everything about it is so incomplete.[4] It seems to be compiled from dislocated pieces; at all events, the connection between the sentences is often obscure. The only use which can be safely made of its testimony regarding some disputed point is of a general kind. Those who hunt for minute details in it have to read them into it, and then, by dint of corrections, they find them in the adjusted text (see on this Reuss, Gesch., § 310). It testifies be-

[1] The convent of Bobbio was founded in the beginning of the seventh century by Columban, an Irish (Scottish) monk. It is probable that the original MS was brought to Europe from Africa during the persecution by the Vandals in the fifth century, or owing to the spread of Islamism in the seventh. Some of the active monks of Bobbio made the extract (or transcript) and translation which remains, while the original is lost. See Credner, Gesch., § 78.

[2] There have been several attempts to reconstruct the Greek. See one in Hilg. Einl., p. 97.

[3] Treg. Can. Mur., p. 10. Hesse believes it to be in its original African Latin (Das Muratorische Fragment, p. 39).

[4] See Volkmar's elaborate treatise denying even the corruptness of the text (Volkmar's Credner's Gesch. des N. T. Kanon, § 164, &c.) He ascribes to it a Romish origin about A.D. 190-200. See an able argument against the ordinary opinion in Donaldson's Hist. of Christ. Lit., vol. iii. p. 203, &c. Dr Donaldson regards the fragment as of Latin (probably African) origin, "towards the end of the first half of the third century."

yond all doubt to two Gospels, and, by fair inference, we get its testimony to the other two. It testifies also to thirteen epistles of St Paul; to the Acts of the Apostles as Luke's; to at least two epistles (perhaps three) of John; and to Jude's epistle, and to the Apocalypse of John.[1] The epistles of James and Peter are not mentioned, and there is no certain reference to Hebrews.[2] On the other hand, a "Book of Wisdom" is named with acceptance in a perplexing way; and an Apocalypse of Peter is accepted by the author, though (like John's) not approved of by all for reading in church. Two forged epistles (to Laodiceans and Alexandrians) are named only to be denounced. Hermas is admitted to private, but not to public, use. Others of the many claimants to recognition in the early Church are named, or obscurely alluded to.[3]

On the whole, we must regard this famous fragment as an unsatisfactory document. If the original be discovered some day, and in its light the multifarious literature of the subject be read, we shall probably have an even more amusing proof of the futility of conjectures than is furnished by the recent publication of the lost parts of the "Epistles of Clement."

XIII.—CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

Titus Flavius Clemens, by birth an Athenian or Alexandrian, originally a pagan,—a man who saw many lands and studied many subjects,—succeeded Pantænus as head of the catechetical school of Alexandria about A.D. 189, and died about thirty years later. He was the teacher of Origen, probably of Hippolytus. His ecclesiastical rank was that of presbyter. Three of his works which remain are a series—(1) An

[1] See for this the allusion to the letters to the seven churches, rather than the reference to John's along with Peter's Apocalypse.

[2] Bunsen conjectures that the allusion to the book written by the friends of Solomon refers to the parallel case of the Epistle to the Hebrews as written by a companion of Paul. Others find "Hebrews" in the Epistle to the Alexandrians. See text and notes.

[3] To the text, which follows Tregelles, may be here added the conclusion as in Hesse, beginning at line 2 of page 8 in our print—". . . . *et ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in ecclesia neque inter prophetas completo numero neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest.* . . . *Arsinoi autem seu Valentini vel Mitiadis nihil in totum recipimus. quin etiam novum psalmorum librum Marcioni conscripserunt. Una cum Basilide Asianum Catafrygum constitutorem [rejicimus].*" Following Van Gilse, he reads "*semota passio*" at our note 12 of p. 6. In these are his most important changes. In our text a comma is omitted after *fuit* on line 10 of p. 6.

Exhortation to the Heathen; (2) The Instructor (παιδαγωγός), being an Exposition of Christ's Character and Precepts, for the benefit of those who have been converted to Christianity; (3) στρώματα or στρωματεῖς (Miscellanies), a collection of notes on the higher Christian γνῶσις, intended to delineate the perfect Christian. There is also a small tract, "Who is the rich man that shall be saved?" He divided the Christian books into "the Gospel" and "the Apostle,"—a division which Origen, after him, adopted. He acknowledged four Gospels, fourteen of St Paul (Philemon, indeed, is not quoted). He ascribes the Acts to Luke; quotes 1 and 2 John, 1 Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse. Of James, 2 Peter, and 3 John we have no recognition. He ascribes Hebrews to Paul, and the Apocalypse to John.

His views of extra-canonical books are the chief difficulty. He uses ecclesiastical writings, especially Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and Hermas; also apocryphal books, such as the Preaching of Peter (much used by Valentinus, Marcion, and Basilides), the Sibylline Oracles, the Revelation of Peter, the Traditions of Matthias, and the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Sometimes he seems to regard them as historical authorities; sometimes he quotes them by way of illustration, sometimes (Sibylline Oracles) as divinely inspired, and as prophecy. In trying to understand his position, we have to remember that he was, and gloried in being, an eclectic in everything. He was a Christian *littérateur* rather than a theologian, a metaphysician rather than a logician. When he quotes books he is not thereby asserting their canonicity. It was one of his accusations against heretics that they did not obey the Divine Scriptures, and kicked off the tradition of the Church. There is no proof that he regarded the book called "Peter's Preaching" as Peter's own composition; and though he quotes the Gospel of the Egyptians, he does not own it as Scripture, or even as authentic. The Sibylline Oracles he did indeed over-estimate, and this is a peculiarity of Clement wherein he did not agree with the general testimony of the Church.[1] The apocryphal books were for the most part written in his own Greek tongue, and were launched in the society amid which his busy life was spent, so that it is easy to understand how different was his estimate of them from that which Tertullian found in the Latin Church, outside of all the movement which they represented.

Clement's view of γνῶσις, as acquaintance with the higher meaning of Scripture, claims also notice here. He believed that "a true tradi-

[1] Justin quotes the Sibyl twice (Apol. I. 20, 44) along with Hystaspes, (*not* "as the Word of God," Sup. Rel., vol. ii. p. 168, but) as he quotes in the same chapters the Stoics, Plato, Menander, as authorities with some, and as illustrations. But Clement goes much further. He calls the Roman Clement "Apostle" (Strom. IV. 17, p. 610); he calls Barnabas "Apostle" (Strom. II. 6, p. 444, &c.), and "the apostolic" (Strom. II. 20, p. 489).

tion of the blessed doctrine" was imparted by Christ to the chief Apostles, and by them handed down to their successors in the Church; and he claimed to have received it through Pantænus. This γνῶσις led to much mysticism, but it also, in Clement's case, was the core of excellent exposition of faith and virtue. It was not contrary to Scripture, not even supplementary to it, but a key to it. "They who are labouring after excellence will not stop in their search for truth until they receive proof from the Scriptures themselves." His rule of faith is the agreement of the Church, the apostles, and prophets. But he appeals less to the objective authority of tradition than Tertullian and Irenæus. His view was, that the Apostles possessed completely what other believers receive partially. He still built all upon Scripture, the wise master-builder being the instructed (Gnostic) Christian teacher. In our text (from Eus. H. E. VI. 14,—see below under "Gospels") he speaks of the four Gospels as standing by themselves. And whatever his διηγήσεις were to which Eusebius (H. E. VI. 14) refers, the only non-canonical books to which they were attached are Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter. He wrote on all the ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί, but (as Lardner says) so did Le Clerc.

XIV.—ORIGEN.

Origen, born A.D. 184, was the "father of Biblical Criticism." He was from his childhood devoted to the study of the Scriptures; and, under much privation—partly brought on him by others, and partly self-caused—he kept the one end before him, with such success that he stands by himself as the greatest and most laborious critic of antiquity. His achievements and his methods of working have powerful influence even to the present day.[1] He was a pupil of Clement, and was head of the catechetical school of Alexandria from the time he was eighteen years of age until he was upwards of forty; thereafter he lived in Cæsarea. He was not always stationary, but at various times made journeys to Athens, Arabia, &c., teaching doctrine and criticism. On one of his journeys he was ordained presbyter in Cæsarea, and (probably on that account) lost the favour of the bishop of Alexandria, by whose council he was deprived of his post as teacher, and of his rank as presbyter.[2]

[1] See Reuss, Gesch., § 511, &c.

[2] It might be alleged that his ordination gave just offence,—first, because he belonged to another diocese; and second, because he had (in unhappy misinterpretation of a saying of our Lord's) mutilated himself. His works, already published, might expose him to the charge of heresy. Jealousy, however, seems to have had much to do with

But although he was accused of heresy by his enemies, the Churches of Palestine, Arabia, and Achaia retained their reverence for him. He suffered great hardships in the Decian persecution (A.D. 250), and died in Tyre about A.D. 253.

He wrote on every book of Scripture—notes, commentaries, or homilies,—5000 volumes in all, say some; more than any other man can read, says Jerome, not unnaturally.[1] Most of his works are lost. Some of them survive in an unsatisfactory Latin translation by Rufinus, or in renderings by Jerome; but his great work against Celsus is complete, and is a memorable record of an early struggle between the assailant and the defender of Christianity. They were well matched in ability—Celsus excelling in general information, while Origen was a master of criticism. The extracts given in the following pages give a fair idea of the chief points of the controversy.[2] The most laborious of all his undertakings was his collation of the versions of the Old Testament, known as his Hexapla and Tetrapla. A work with parallel columns in such elaborate fashion was not likely to be multiplied, and it has been lost, except some fragments.

On the whole, we find from Eusebius's elaborate statement that Origen received the four Gospels, the Acts, 13 Epp. of Paul, and Hebrews (whether Paul's or not), 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Apocalypse (which he regarded as the writing of John the Apostle). While his opinions are thus far certain, there is doubt as to the other books. James and Jude are not mentioned at all; and 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John are mentioned, but said to be of disputed genuineness. If, however, we accept the translations of his Homilies on Genesis and Joshua, we find that, when speaking popularly, he treated James and Jude as integral parts of the New Testament; that 2 Peter and "the epistles" of John occupy the same rank; and that he ascribed fourteen epistles to St Paul.[3]

There is a passage in one of Origen's Commentaries in which he seems to make a threefold classification of sacred books.[4] He is speaking of the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, and says, "*ἐξετάζοντες περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου πότερόν ποτε γνήσιόν ἐστιν ἢ νόθον ἢ μικτόν.*" The specialties of the book under his consideration made the inquiry as to its being genuine or spurious, or part of both, only natural. It does not appear that Origen proceeded upon such a classification in other cases. Elsewhere[5] he states with-

Dionysius's proceedings. See Hefele, Hist. of Councils, p. 87. On the true rendering of Mat. xix. 12, see Origen, Hom. in Mat., tom. xv. p. 651 (Migne, vol. iii. p. 1253).

[1] See on his seven shorthand writers, his book-writers, and the girls who wrote the fair copies, Eus. H. E. VI. 23.

[2] See a lively account of Celsus's work by J. A. Froude, 'Fraser's Magazine,' Feb. 1878.

[3] See under "New Testament as a whole," p. 51.

[4] See Reuss, Gesch., § 311, for an elaborate commentary upon it. See also Credren, Gesch., § 87.

[5] De Princ. Præf., vol. viii. p. 49.

out qualification that the *Prædicatio Petri* is an ecclesiastical book, not written by Peter or by any one else divinely inspired.

Origen, as a public speaker and teacher, was well versed in current literature, and both recognised and praised Christian books which are not included in the canon. But he wrote no commentary on any book not in our present canon. He mentions the Gospel of the Hebrews, but with a half apology for using its narrative; the Gospels of Peter and of James he mentions as containing a tradition; and he cites a phrase from the Acts of Paul. He calls "Barnabas" a Catholic Epistle; and in one passage (Latin) has it with "*sicut in multis Scripturis invenimus.*" He mentions with favour the Epistle of Clement. His opinion of Hermas is "*quæ Scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata;*" but he elsewhere says that, though widely circulated, it is not accepted by all. Origen did not confine inspiration to canonical books: his generous spirit recognised all truth as from God, without therefore admitting that its expression is authoritative.

XV.—THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY.

There are few controversies which have made so great a noise as that which is called the Paschal Controversy. It was a subject of considerable interest in the second century and thereafter; but it became one of engrossing importance in the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century. The peculiarity of the revived interest is, that it did not content itself with the same range as that within which the first excitement was confined.

The *Asiatic Christians of the second century were at issue with the rest of Christendom as to the proper day for closing the fast which preceded the observance of Easter.* That was the subject of the original Paschal Controversy.[1] The Tübingen scholars of the nineteenth century endeavoured to make the controversy affect the genuineness of the Gospel of John. The controversialists of the early Church never once believed or imagined that the genuineness of John's Gospel was at stake during their dispute. Nay, it appears in the records of the controversy that the Gospel was admitted about A.D. 170. And it can be

[1] See text, p. 189, where Eusebius says the Asiatics "σελήνης τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην ᾤοντο δεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς παραφυλάττειν . . . τὰς τῶν ἀσιτιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιεῖσθαι;" while the other Churches had another custom derived from apostolic tradition,—"ὡς μὴ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ προσήκειν παρὰ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡμέραν τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύεσθαι."

proved from other evidence (see our text, p. 167, &c.) that it was admitted long before.

The attempt of Baur and his followers is to show that in Asia Minor, where John lived and died, his authority was quoted in favour of the commemoration of Christ's last supper[1] with His disciples on the 14th Nisan,—a day when, according to his Gospel, the supper could not take place, because the Gospel represents Him as dying on that day. In other words, say Baur and his followers, the actual oral testimony of John was that Christ died on the day when the Synoptists say He died, the 15th; but the testimony of the Gospel falsely ascribed to him is that Christ died the day before.

It would be easy to dwell on several peculiarities of this controversy even as now stated. It is natural, for example, to remark on the assumption that the traditional story is correct, and that the fourth Gospel is the pretender; whereas one might easily hold by the other view, that the local controversialists misinterpreted the Apostle's practice, and that his real opinion must be learned from his book. It is natural also to say that there is grave doubt whether discrepancy really exists between John and the Synoptists, and that, in point of fact, there is no such discrepancy;[2] so that no argument from its existence can be brought against the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. We might almost protest against the assumption that the 14th was originally kept in Asia Minor as the day of Christ's partaking of the Passover, for it was really kept as the day of the Jewish Passover. Nor is it easy to refrain from remarking that so grave questions as the truthfulness and authorship of the fourth Gospel are not fairly solved by mere inferences from fragmentary notices of an obscure controversy.

But we need not tarry on the threshold. It will appear, when we have concluded the inquiry on which we are about to enter, that the controversy did not refer to the day of the Saviour's death, but to the proper day of closing a fast.[3] It will appear that whether or not the aged Apostle sanctioned a particular observance on a particular day, as was alleged in Ephesus half a century after his death, the fact of such

[1] The words quoted in last note, "ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς," are the strong point of this position, in so far as Eusebius is concerned.

[2] It seems to me that Wieseler (Synopsis) has made out this case.

[3] It may be well to translate here what Eusebius says about the controversy (he is speaking of the days of Victor in the end of the second century, say A.D. 190): "There was considerable discussion in the days of these men, because the Churches (παροικίαι) of all Asia, supposing that (ὡς ἄν) they followed a tradition of older date, thought it necessary, on the occasion of the feast of the Christian Passover [passover of salvation], to observe specially the 14th of the month (the day on which the Jews were enjoined to slay the lamb), and believed that it was altogether necessary on that day, whatever day of the week it might happen to be, to terminate the fasts; whereas it was not the custom for the Churches in all the rest of the world to follow this mode, because they observed the custom which, handed down from the days of the Apostles, prevails till now—viz., that it is not fitting to terminate the fasts on any other day than that of the Saviour's resurrection" (H. E. V. 23,—see text, p. 189).

sanction does not touch the question as to the day when Jesus Christ was crucified, still less the question as to the authorship of the Gospel which bears John's name.

It is very difficult to present the Paschal Controversy in its right proportions. It is a complicated subject, and it involves a considerable amount of detail.

The discussion which follows will be under the following heads, and references to the extracts in our text will enable the student to confirm or challenge our own statements :—

1°. The Authorities from whom we learn the Nature and Progress of the Controversy.
2°. The Controversy and the Combatants at successive stages.
3°. Conclusions.

1. *The Authorities from whom we learn the Nature and Progress of the Paschal Controversy in the Early Church.* (See text, pp. 189-195.)

First, and chief of all, comes *Eusebius*, who (H. E. V. 23,—see text, p. 189) tells us of a dispute between Victor, the hot-headed bishop of Rome (A.D. 190), and the Church of Asia Minor, regarding the observance of the 14th Nisan. Victor wanted the Asiatics to adopt the Western custom of keeping Good Friday and Easter (ruling their observance by the day of the week), and when they would not adopt it, he excommunicated them! Among those who opposed Victor's arrogant proceedings was Irenæus of Lyons, by birth and training an Asiatic Christian, though now a Western bishop. He approved of the Western form of observance, but not of Victor's attempt to coerce the Asiatics into it.

In the course of his letter to Victor, Irenæus (see p. 191) refers to a period (some five-and-thirty years before) when his old master Polycarp visited Rome, in the time of Anicetus. It appears that Polycarp and Anicetus had discussed the subject of the observance at Easter, the Roman insisting on the day of the week, the Asiatic on the day of the month; but although one could not persuade the other, they parted as friends. In their eyes, and in the eyes of Irenæus, the dispute was not of any vital moment.

Eusebius (H. E. IV. 26) refers to a work of Melito on the Passover, which fixes its own date by speaking of a dispute in Laodicea regarding the Passover during the proconsulate of Servilius Paulus—*i.e.*, about A.D. 175.

To Eusebius, therefore, we are indebted for information regarding three periods of time—Polycarp's time, about A.D. 160;[1] Melito's time,

[1] On the date of Polycarp see p. xxxv, and note 1 there.

A.D. 175; Victor's time, A.D. 190. These are separated by intervals of about fifteen years.

Hippolytus (p. 192) is another authority. Writing about A.D. 220, he speaks of certain contemporaries who wished to observe the 14th Nisan. He charges them with wilful subservience to the obsolete ritual of Judaism, and with forgetfulness of the fact that the Jews slew (ἀναιρεῖν) the true Passover.

Epiphanius (p. 195), about A.D. 368, treats of the "Quarto-decimans" he (or observers of the 14th Nisan—*i.e.*, the representatives of the old Asiatic custom) as heretics. His argument is the usual argument of the Western Church, that Christ, being the True Passover, *must* have been slain on the day when the Jews killed the paschal lamb.

Last of all, we have "*The Paschal Chronicle*" (see p. 193, note 5), which professes to give extracts from early writers. The Tübingen scholars, though sceptical about things most surely received in the Christian Scriptures, grasp at those extracts with an eager credulity which is nothing less than amazing. A glance at the alleged extracts shows that they indulge in a style of exegesis much more mystical than we should have been prepared by what we read in Eusebius and elsewhere to find characterising their reputed authors. Furthermore, the passage ascribed to Hippolytus is not found in his works which are in our hands. No such book as that ascribed to Apollinarius is found in the lists of his writings given by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius. Although these facts dispose us to give little heed to the Chronicle, we shall endeavour to consider its statements in some detail.

2. *The Controversy and the Combatants at successive stages.*

As we have said already, and shall have frequent occasion to observe in the sequel, the controversy was about the proper day of closing a fast. The Christians of every land, Asia Minor alone excepted, kept the Lord's Day in Easter week as the day of the Resurrection, and closed on that day a fast which they had been observing (see p. 190). But the Christians of Asia had a sacred feast on the 14th Nisan (on whatever day of the week it might fall), and closed their fast on that day—the day when Jews slew their passover (see p. 189). Christendom, in short, (Palestine included), terminated the fast on a particular day of the week; Asia Minor terminated the fast on a particular day of the month.

But darkness comes when we go further, and ask what was the exact observance of the 14th in Asia. What was meant by παραφυλάττειν or by τηρεῖν—the words (pp. 189, 191) used for observing the day? They denoted the end of a fast. But in what way it was connected with Christ is uncertain.

The assumption of Baur, that the observance of the day implied the belief on the part of the original observers that Christ had taken the Passover on the 14th, contradicts the historical basis of the observance itself. Its origin was Jewish, not Christian; but it became Christian. It was in later times "The Feast of the Passover of Salvation," not because of the mere date (as Baur's argument requires), but because of the deep truth it commemorated.

The following seems to be the way in which the diverging customs originated. The Jewish Christians, including even Paul himself (Acts xix., xx.) continued when they were at Jerusalem to observe the Jewish feasts more or less regularly, as long as the Temple stood (see 1 Cor. viii., x.; Rom. xiv.). It must have been somewhat different when they were not at Jerusalem; but the Jews who did not make a pilgrimage to the Holy City observed the Passover in so far as to eat unleavened bread, and to rest from work on both the Sabbath days of the feast ("days of holy convocation"), and very possibly took some social meal at the hour of the Paschal Supper in Jerusalem. Thus Paul is said to sail away from Philippi towards Troas "after the days of unleavened bread," Acts xx. 6. There seems to be an allusion to this custom also in 1 Cor. v. 6. This—written to the Corinthian Church—shows at least how familiar the readers of the Epistle were with the custom of observing days of unleavened bread.

The custom of having a special observance of the 14th Nisan of course prevailed most and longest where Jews were more numerous than Gentiles in the Church. The Ephesian Church was at first mainly Jewish, as our notices of Aquila and Priscilla, and of the work done in the synagogue, and of the disciples of the Baptist, &c., may serve to show (Acts xviii. 19, &c.; xix. 1, &c.; Rev. ii. 1, &c.); and St John no doubt found it so on his arrival. That he would take part in the observance of the day of the Passover is most likely. Hence the yearly observance of the 14th Nisan in Ephesus, as elsewhere,—an observance, Jewish in its origin and Jewish in its associations, which lingered on long after the Temple had been overthrown, and the Jews were left without any national meeting-place or festivals. Christian associations gathered round it as years passed on.

In some other Churches it died out altogether, and there grew up instead a yearly celebration of Christ's resurrection on Easter Sunday, and in consequence a commemoration of His death on the Friday before. Hence some difference of custom, which at first was regarded as of no great importance. But practically it came to this, that the Churches of Asia, which had been confirmed in their observance by having had John surviving to sanction it among them (long after the other Apostles had passed away from the midst of other Churches), *kept*, and the rest of the Christian world *did not keep*, the 14th Nisan. They kept it, not because of Jewish Law, nor because of Christian Law, but

because of an old abiding custom.[1] The idea of the Jewish Passover had fallen into the background, and the thought of Christ as the True and Divine Passover had become prominent. Hence it became "the Feast of the Passover of Salvation."

What, then, of the fasting which seems to have been really the practical occasion of the controversy? In answering this question as regards the Western Church, we need have no difficulty. When the year brought round the time which had been of old that of the Passover, the Western Christians fasted on the day of the week when Jesus Christ died, and the day He was in the grave,[2] but closed their fasts on the Lord's Day—the day of the Resurrection. There is more difficulty as to the Oriental or Asiatic Church. In it, however, we must remember that the Jewish element predominated. The Asiatics had always on the evening of the 14th kept a feast (ἑορτή), a glad feast, and yet a solemn, as all the Passovers of old were; and although they had come to associate it with Christian ideas, it was most of all with the idea that Christ is the better Passover, the True Deliverer from awful death, so that their feast was still a glad one. If they had been fasting before, they would close their fast before this, their feast, began. Hence apparently the discrepancy in the practice of the two branches of the Church.

At all events, it is on the simple point of an existing discrepancy that Polycarp and Anicetus were disputing when Irenæus gives us a glimpse of the earliest-known phase of the controversy. Irenæus, in writing to Victor (see page 191), tells us that when Anicetus of Rome desired Polycarp of Smyrna to give up the custom of keeping the feast (*i.e.*, closing the fast) on the 14th Nisan, Polycarp refused, and defended his practice by pleading that John and the other Apostles with whom he had been conversant always kept that day. Anicetus, on the other hand, held fast by his own Western custom, on the ground that it had been observed by the Presbyters who were before him. No interruption of the peace of the Church was caused by this difference of custom: the two bishops joined in worship and communion, and observers (τηροῦντες) and non-observers (μὴ τηροῦντες) parted in perfect peace and amity.

So far as we can see, the whole dispute was about the Asiatic custom of observing the 14th Nisan as a festal-day, and of therefore closing the fast on that day. There is no trace of a mention of John's Gospel. There is no trace of the controversy being affected by any decision as to the day on which our Lord suffered. Had the dispute at all turned on the observance of a day in commemoration of Christ's

[1] Thus we read in the letter of Irenæus that Polycarp and Anicetus tried to persuade each other, but without success.

[2] The time of fasting was not of equal duration in all places. See what Irenæus says, p. 191, line 17.

death, it is impossible that it could have been carried on without quotations from the Gospels. We have to bear in mind, too, that the story is told by Irenæus, whose full faith in the four Gospels—our four, and those only—is as well known as anything can be. He relates the dispute with no trace of an idea that the authenticity of the fourth Gospel is concerned. And he tells of Polycarp, the disciple of John himself, who had sat at the aged Apostle's feet, and had heard him often speak of the old days when the "Word made flesh dwelt among men."

This is made still clearer when we see the earlier part of Irenæus's letter, in which he explicitly says that the whole dispute was about a fast—when it began, and how long it lasted—and implies by his silence that the date of our Lord's suffering was not involved at all. "For the dispute is not only about the day, but also about the character of the fast. For some think that they ought to fast one day, others two, and others more; some measure their day as containing forty hours night and day. And this diversity among them that observe it is not a thing of our own time only, but at a much earlier time prevailed among those before us, who, perhaps not having ruled very strictly, established for the future a custom which arose in simplicity and isolation (*peculiarity*, ἰδιωτισμόν). But, nevertheless, all those men were at peace, and we are at peace with one another, and the difference in fasting establishes the unity of our faith" (p. 191).

The next notice of the subject in Eusebius (H. E. IV. 26—see p. 192) refers to a discussion which took place in Laodicea. He says that Melito, Bishop of Sardis, wrote a book on the Passover beginning thus:—

"In the time of Servilius Paulus, Proconsul of Asia, at which time Sagaris bore his testimony, there took place much discussion in Laodicea about the Passover, which fell at the exact time in those days."

The meaning is, that in the time of Sagaris, on one occasion the day of the week and the day of the month of Christ's crucifixion corresponded, so that the Asiatics and the Western Church were observing the same day. The coincidence was so different from the usual state of the case, in which one part of Christendom was fasting in sorrow, while the other was joyfully celebrating the Resurrection, that men were led to pay special attention to the reckoning on which they had proceeded before. Melito accordingly wrote his book. Eusebius goes on to tell us that "Clement of Alexandria mentions this book in his own work on the Passover, which he says he wrote on occasion of Melito's work."

This is all which is said on the subject by Eusebius, and it indicates discussion without intimating that it led to a quarrel, or even was unfriendly.

We now come to the Third period, to which Eusebius is our guide—A.D. 190. It is here we learn that the Churches of Asia agreed that it was necessary to close the fast on the 14th day of the month (*τὰς τῶν ἀσιτιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιεῖσθαι*), whatever day of the week it might fall; whereas all the other Churches of the Christian world preserved the custom which had come down from apostolical tradition, to close the fast on no other day than that of the Saviour's resurrection—viz., Sunday. So the bishops of other Churches drew up a decree, saying that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated (*ἐπιτελοῖτο*) on no other day than the Lord's Day, "and that on that day only we observe the termination of the Paschal fasts" (p. 190).

But Polycrates (of Ephesus) led the bishops of Asia, who stoutly asserted (*διϊσχυριζομένων*) that they should at all hazards maintain their own traditional custom. In his letter to Victor and the Roman Church, he cites the great names of apostolic men who had fallen asleep in Asia, and who had sanctioned the Asiatic observance. "All these," he says, "kept the day of the 14th of the Passover *according to the Gospel*, making no deviation, but walking according to the rule of the faith." He speaks of John as "he who leaned upon the Lord's breast."

Victor thereupon published an excommunication of all those men as heterodox. But the other bishops refused to agree with him, and exhorted him, on the contrary, to contemplate a course that was calculated to promote peace, unity, and mutual love. Irenæus seems to have been the chief of Victor's opponents on this point, and in name (*ἐκ προσώπου*) of the brethren over whom he presided in Gaul, he wrote a weighty letter. Asiatic though he was by birth, he agreed with the Western Church in regard to observance; but treating this as a small matter, he reminds Victor that he was aiming at the impossible in seeking uniformity in such things. He tells the story of Polycarp and Anicetus, as already abridged on p. xc.

If now we look back on the whole narrative of Eusebius, we find that from first to last the whole dispute is caused by a want of uniformity in the date of closing a fast which seems to have usually preceded the time of the Passover,—the Asiatics following the Jews in going by the 14th day of the moon. Those Asiatics traditionally observed a feast-day on the 14th, but, as we have said, instead of a Jewish, it had become, by the natural course of events, a purely Christian one. So far as we can see, the fourth Gospel is in no way concerned. "The Gospel" (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*) seems to be supposed to be one harmonious narrative (p. 191). John's own countenance to the observance is indeed pleaded—and probably rightly pleaded—but in his day the feast was still a Jewish one. And even in the later times, when the "feast of the Christian Passover" was the name for it, the original idea still coloured the whole view taken of it.

But whatever it was about, the controversy was not about the fourth Gospel, and did not involve the authenticity of that Gospel. The men who conducted it were well aware of the existence of that Gospel, and it was impossible to have kept its authenticity out of dispute, if it had been really concerned. Dr Davidson says that the Christians of Asia Minor knew the fourth Gospel, but did not acknowledge it as John's. But we can only admit this when we forget that during the very prevalence of the controversy Irenæus was writing upon the Gospels, and that this Gospel was quoted by other writers at a still earlier date.

Upon what, then, if not on the narrative of Eusebius, do the opponents of the Gospel rely? Upon the anonymous Paschal Chronicle, and especially on the words quoted from *Apollinaris* or *Apollinarius*, who was Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia about A.D. 170-180. Eusebius does not seem to have heard of his work on the Passover (see Eus. H. E. IV. 27). His testimony, however, is quoted in course of a long dissertation by the writer of the preface to the Chronicle, the object of which (see p. 193 and note) is to show that Christ, as being the true Paschal Lamb, must have fulfilled the type of the former Paschal lambs by dying on the 14th. The whole argument is one of typology.

The writer, however, adduces testimonies in favour of the position he thus maintains. The first extract (p. 193) is said to be from Hippolytus, "Book against all Heresies." The passage is not found in Hippolytus's work which has come down to us.[1] But, assuming that it is true, what does it say? It is in the same line as the extracts from *Apollinarius* which follow. It is to the effect that Christ *did not eat* the Passover before suffering, but Himself suffered as the true Passover.

The second alleged extract from Hippolytus is to the same effect. Christ did not eat the Passover, but died.

It is needless to say that these passages distinctly contradict, not John, but the Synoptists.

The next authority cited is *Apollinarius*:—

1. We see that *Apollinarius* considers the whole controversy—as Polycarp and Anicetus did before, and as Irenæus did at a later date—a very subordinate one. It is a case of ignorance, pardonable ignorance —a mistake. This could not have been his language had the grave question of the canonicity of John's Gospel been involved.

2. As regards *ἀσύμφωνος τῷ νόμῳ*,—this means that the idea of the Quarto-decimans contradicts the law in so far as the Passover (and therefore Christ as the Passover) must be offered on the 14th. He says that the 14th was the day of the true Passover,—not because Christ had

[1] In his Ref. Haer. VIII. 12, 5 (Duncker), we have Hippolytus denouncing the Quarto-decimans of his day (say A.D. 220), but with the additional statement that in all save that one thing—the observance of *τὸ πάσχα* on the 14th—they agreed with the Catholic Church.

eaten on it the typical Passover with the Jews, but because He Himself, as the true Passover, had offered Himself to God. It appears from this, that in *Apollinarius's* day men were defending their keeping of the feast on that day by saying that Christ Himself kept one.

3. The words στασιάζειν κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια may be translated in two ways, either of which comes to the same conclusion—viz., that there was some discrepancy between John and the Synoptists. This may be (1) said to be the opinion of the Asiatics, or (2) it may (more probably) be a hesitating conclusion drawn by *Apollinarius* himself. But in either case it implies that John and the Synoptists were accepted by all concerned as kindred and equally valuable histories. For it is not Mark or Luke that is at conflict with Matthew; if any one, it is John. It is most natural to believe that *Apollinarius* (or rather, the author of the extract) is making an inference from the fact that those Quarto-decimans quoted Matthew, and that he in a hesitating way suggests that John seems to favour the other view. It is to be observed that neither *Apollinarius* nor any one else attempts to meet the clear statement of the Synoptists, that Christ did partake of the Passover before He suffered; and, with the exception of this very vague allusion, they do not seem to think that John was at issue with the other evangelists. *Apollinarius's* whole case was rested on the typological idea that Jesus, being the true Passover, *must have died* on the 14th.

This, then, far from being against John's Gospel, is really in its favour. So is the next extract from *Apollinarius*, in which, with elaborate eloquence, he declares that "the 14th is the true Passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, who, being God's Son (παῖς), was instead of the Lamb, who was bound, and bound the strong man, who was judged and is Judge of quick and dead, and who was delivered into the hands of sinners that He might be crucified; who was exalted on the horns of the unicorn, and who was wounded in His holy side; who poured out from that side the two things that cleanse again (?), blood and water, Logos and Spirit; and who was buried on the day of the Passover, a stone being laid on His tomb."

Here we observe that not only is the writer's own view that the 14th is the day of Christ's burial, and therefore may be said to agree with what is often supposed to be the view taken in John's Gospel, but he clearly quotes John in speaking of the water and the blood which flowed from the wounded side. This, therefore, makes nothing against, but much for, the general reception of that Gospel which the Tübingen scholars allege to have been forged twenty years before.[1]

[1] "Apollinarius's" own views regarding the observance of the 14th are not made very clear. But whatever they were, it is amazing that Hilgenfeld should build upon them such a superstructure as that Melito and Apollinarius were foes—Melito the champion of the Quarto-decimans, and Apollinarius of a deutero-Johannine party,

The extract from Clement leads us to remark that the Western Church had the worst of the argument from Scripture, when the other side could point to the clear statements of Matthew (representing the Synoptists). They endeavoured to show that the supper which our Lord ate with His disciples was not the real Paschal Supper, but a preparatory meal at which He instructed them in the true meaning of the Passover. Clement, of course, believed in the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel, and quotes John in speaking of the washing of the feet.

Conclusion.

We have seen that the subject was the observance of the 14th day of Nisan as a day of a feast necessitating the closing of the fast. It is obscure enough, and the Asiatic Christians went on in their course, although the other parts of Christendom opposed their practice of having a feast at the close of their fast, on the day of the Jewish Passover. We have seen that John's Gospel is never supposed to be at stake by any of the disputants. We have seen some of the disputants quote it. We have seen Polycrates describe John as one who leaned on the Lord's breast, and in the same breath say that the Asiatic custom was according to the concurrent teaching of the Gospels (*κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*). We have "Apollinarius" referring to the blood and water which came from the wounded side of Jesus; we know that Irenæus took part in the controversy, and told an anecdote of his old master Polycarp, without seeming to know that the truth of that Gospel which must have been specially dear to Polycarp was at issue.

And we are asked to believe that the fourth Gospel was, meanwhile, struggling into position as a standard in the Church; that in some places it was accepted, and in others unknown; that it was known in Asia Minor, but not believed to be John's; and yet that never from first to last did any one refer to it! If the followers of Baur could hold that John's Gospel was not yet written, that until the end of the second century there was no such book,—they would be at least consistent. But this is what they cannot say. Even Baur himself admitted that John's Gospel was written in A.D. 160, and his followers have been driven back step by step, until by some a date in the very beginning of the century is admitted.[1] The whole elaborate argument, therefore, that John's Gospel could not have existed, is upset by the simple proof that it did exist. And the idea that, although the Gospel was known by those Asiatics, it was repudiated by them as not

placing a second Johannine tradition in opposition to the first. He also would have it that Hippolytus is replying to Melito, so that *λέγει γὰρ οὕτως* (p. 194, line 1) is, "Melito says," &c.

[1] See Christlieb's 'Modern Doubts and the Christian Faith,' for a graphic sketch of the "Tübingen School."

being John's, and yet that there never in the heat of controversy was one word dropped to show that this was their conviction, asks us to admit more than is reasonable. Whatever that discussion about the Passover was—and it is in some respects obscure enough—it was a pitiful wrangle as compared with the momentous controversy which Baur would fain have us decide by an inference from it.

XVI.—APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE.

The meaning of the name Apocrypha, as applied to certain books, is a subject of dispute. What is "hidden" may be the origin of the books, or it may be the esoteric doctrines they are supposed to contain. But there is no doubt that the word Apocrypha came to denote what is in a particular way opposed to canonical. The apocryphal books were not, indeed, canonical, but neither were they secular: they competed with the canonical books for the regard of the Christian Church. For the most part they claimed to have an origin and authority fully equal to those of the sacred books which were usually accepted in the Church.[1]

Speaking generally, it may be said that they took their rise in the heresies of the second and fourth centuries. The heretics who sought to establish their views in the midst of the Church, which held by certain books and by their ordinary interpretation, were under the necessity of (1) putting forced interpretations on the true books; or (2) of altering the text of those true books; or (3) of constructing new books for themselves. We find, as a matter of fact, that sometimes one of these courses was adopted, sometimes heretics followed all the three. The chief motive-power was Gnosticism.

Gnosticism—which was in the main an attempt to combine revelation with philosophy—was older than Christianity, and originated in the encounter of the Jews of the dispersion with the philosophies of Greece and of the East. The tendency to manufacture semi-sacred books, and the tendency to forge books under famous names, were in full operation at the beginning of the Christian era. There were at that date books current under the names of Adam, Moses, &c.; and others called after Orpheus, Musæus, Homer, &c. Paul alludes to forged epistles, 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17. It is not impossible that he has forged documents in view in 1 Tim. iv. 7; Titus i. 14,[2] whose authors were Christians that

[1] See Tischendorf, De Evang. Apoc. Origine et Usu.
[2] See Semler, Proleg. in Ep. Jacobi, pp. 18, 20.

had gone back to Judaism. (Compare Titus i. 20, 22; 2 Tim. iv. 5). Gnosticism was essentially eclectic, and its chief endeavours were directed to the formation of systems with some room in them for everything. Just as it drew from Zoroaster, from the Old Testament, from current philosophy, so also did it draw from pretended Old Testament writings, bearing ancient names (such as those of Adam, Seth, the Twelve Patriarchs); and also from pretended New Testament writings ascribed to the Apostles, or (indirectly) to Christ Himself.

The time when the Christian Apocrypha were written was, as we have said, the period from the second to the fourth century. In the second century men began to appeal to the written Word, because the living voice of those who had heard Jesus, or who had known those that companied with Him, was hushed in death. Especially, when controversy arose, was there an appeal to "that which is written." The increasing authority thus ascribed to the sacred books led the heretics, in simple defence of their own position, to forge rivals and counterparts. Did the orthodox appeal to the words of Paul, or Peter, or John? The heretics had also apostolic words to fall back upon. Here they are! The Gospel of "Philip," or of "Thomas," or of "Bartholomew," or of "Peter." So again in the fourth century, when the common opinion of the Christian Church had gravitated to agreement on the contents of the canon, and the Church had sufficient unity to make public and recognised use of the canon or collection, we find a large and widely-known number of books outside of that canon. They were not all Gospels. Some of them were Acts; some had other names; most of them had received their first shape in the second century, but had been subsequently manipulated by successive editors.

It must not be supposed that all extra-canonical books were regarded as heretical. There was a class of books, known as useful or ecclesiastical, which were not supposed to be authoritative. Some of them were special favourites in particular districts, and were habitually read in the churches, although they were not standards of doctrine. The "Apostolic Fathers" belonged to this class, although there were also others in it. Beneath those books, and quite distinct from them, was the class of heretical books which heretics had invented or altered so as to gain confirmation for their own dogmas. The famous classification of Eusebius (see pp. 10, 11) is based in the main on the general acceptance of particular books by the Christian Church; but it contains also an outspoken declaration, that while some books were disqualified from being regarded as canonical by their being only known to sections of the Church, there were others, the acceptance of which was not only partial but confined to heretics.

The sacred writings of the first class were set on an eminence sacred to themselves. No other writings were ever admitted to that position by the Catholic Church. It is true that individual writers may be

quoted as referring to those writings which were on the whole rejected; and it is true that sects of heretics affected to regard particular apocryphal books as the true Scriptures. But it is also true that no consensus of testimony in favour of any apocryphal book can be produced, and that no book, even of the useful or ecclesiastical sort, has any such witness in its favour as to admit of its being even put into comparison with any book now in the canon.[1] One province or one sect might favour this book or that, but Christendom as a whole was not affected by the local predilection.

When we look at the New Testament Apocrypha as a whole in order to analyse or classify the list of some fifty Gospels,[2] we find that it may be reduced considerably.

In many cases the word "Gospel" did not claim to denote a historical work, but what we may call an outline of the doctrine of Christianity. This was St Paul's meaning when he spoke of "my Gospel" (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25, &c.) The "Teaching of Peter" may have been such a mixture of fact, argument, and illustration as would be furnished by a condensed report of Peter's addresses. Thus also Valentinus's "Gospel of Truth" appears to have been a doctrine of salvation, and not a life of Jesus (Iren. B. III. 2, 9).[3] So also Manes, the founder of the Manichees, promulgated a "Living Gospel," or "Gospel of Life," or "Living Truth." Such books "made the Gospel of none effect;" but they were not competing historical narratives.

Again, some of the false Gospels were probably only a true Gospel altered to suit the views of a particular man or sect or party. We know that Marcion's Gospel was an altered Luke; Basilides may perhaps have made Matthew (Matthias? see text, p. 389, and Clem., Strom. VII. 17, 108, p. 900) his basis; and Apelles is said to have made similar use of John.[4] Some of the Gospels, themselves originally apocryphal, were certainly reissued with changes according to the ideas of successive editors. The numerous extant Gospels of the Nativity are

[1] See Kleuker, 'Ausführliche Untersuchung der Gründe für die Aechtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der schriftlichen Urkunden des Christenthums:' Dritte Abtheilung, §§ 879-893. There is much valuable matter in this book.

[2] See Fabricius's Codex Apocryphus, and Kleuker, vol. v. § 898. Compare the Decree of Gelasius in our text, p. 24. See also Migne, 'Dictionnaire des Apocryphes.'

[3] The charge which Irenæus brings against Valentinus is that his system was no fair inference from, or representation of, the truth of Christ. The ground idea of his theory was that men are divided into πνευματικοί or φρόνιμοι; ψυχικοί; σαρκικοί. The first class are also γνωστικοί. They, being spiritual men, are wholly saved, obtaining after this life a spiritual body, which indeed they already carry within them. The second class raise themselves—not without difficulty—above the indwelling of the Creator-Æon or inferior God (δημιουργός), and come under angelic guidance so as to reach purity, but it is purity without a body. The third class perish wholly, both soul and body, being unfit for anything better. Those who wish to see how the human mind runs the same round of speculation in successive ages may compare those views of Valentinus with the speculations on the resurrection body in W. R. Greg's 'Enigmas of Life.'

[4] There is doubt if this can be made out regarding the last two. See p. 94.

only recensions or editions of the Protevangel or "Gospel of James." There are several of those ancient Gospels of which we know only the names, and it is supposed that many of them are the same book under different names. We know something (see text) of the Gospel of the Nazarenes and of the Gospel of the Ebionites, and we have reason to believe that those, as well as the Gospels of Bartholomew, of Cerinthus, and of the Twelve Apostles, were recensions of the Gospel of the Hebrews. And this was apparently a recension of St Matthew.

There was another and a large class, professing to contain true traditions of Christian doctrine, which had come down by special channels to the authors. Thus the "Gospel of Judas Iscariot" (Iren. B. I. 35) professed to give the true account of the motives of Judas in seeking to terminate the baleful reign of Jehovah by betraying Jesus Christ. The Cainites professed to find their perfect knowledge in a book that Paul composed after being in the third heavens. The "Gospel of Philip" (as stated below) is a collection of ascetic Gnostic traditions, using the authority of Christ to attack marriage, &c.[1]

Again it is probable that several of the so-called Gospels were compilations from the canonical Gospels. Tatian's Diatessaron was an avowed harmony, and it did not stand alone. Ambrosius, a friend of Origen, says: "*Plerique etiam ex quatuor Evangelii libris in unum ea, quæ veneratis putaverunt assertionibus convenientia, referserunt.*"[2] The book which Serapion found in circulation in Rhossus (Eus. H. E. VI. 12), professing to be the Gospel of Peter, seems to have been a harmony of the Gospel narratives, but with Docetic additions. Jerome, followed by the Decree of Gelasius, condemns the codices of Hesychius and Lucian, which seem to have been some kind of harmony, with additions.[3]

We may divide all the Christian apocryphal books or writings into Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses.[4] Of extant[5] apocryphal

[1] As frequently noticed in our text, many Gnostics, without giving their views in a narrative form, professed to have derived the theories which formed the basis of their philosophisings through a direct and true tradition from the Apostles. Thus Valentinus said that his doctrine came from Paul through Theodades or Theodas, a scholar of Paul; and Basilides said that his came through Glaucias, a disciple of Peter (Clem. Alex., Strom. VII. 17, p. 898). See before, p. xlix., and p. 417.

[2] Ambros. Proem. in Evang. Luc. See Kleuker.

[3] Thus Jerome in IV. Evv. Præf. ad Damasum says of their work: "Cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat, falsa esse quæ addita sunt."

[4] This division is best for practical purposes, as corresponding with the contents of the New Testament. See the Notitia et Fragmenta (xl. fere) Evangeliorum Apocryphorum in Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., p. 335.

[5] Of apocryphal Gospels still extant, the most complete edition is Tischendorf's, and in it are twenty-two books, some of them duplicates or recensions of the same work. They are—1. The Protevangelium or Gospel of James (Greek); 2. Pseudo-Matthew (Latin); 3. Gospel of the Nativity of Mary (Latin); 4. History of Joseph the Carpenter (Latin, from Arabic); 5-7. Gospel of Thomas (three recensions—two Greek, one Latin); 8. Gospel of the Infancy (Latin, from Arabic); 9-11. Acts of Pilate (three recensions—two Greek, one Latin); 12-14. Descent of Christ to the Dead (three recensions—one Greek and two Latin); 15, 16. An Epistle of Pilate to

Gospels, the most important, as claiming, in whole or part, to date from the second century, are the Protevangelium or Gospel of James, the Gospel of Thomas, the Acts of Pilate (sometimes published as the first part of the Gospel of Nicodemus). These, then, refer respectively to the parentage, the childhood, and the death of Jesus Christ, and each of them had many imitators.[1]

The *Protevangel*, probably dating from the middle of the second century, and brought to Europe from the Levant by Postel in the sixteenth century, professes to give a narrative of earlier events than are found in the canonical Gospels. There are in it various incidents and statements to which reference is made by early Fathers: as, for example, the birth in the cave (Justin Martyr, Dial. 78[2]); the perpetual virginity of Mary (as Clem. Alex. refers to it[3]); the brethren of the Lord being Joseph's children by a former marriage (Origen, see pp. 464, 467[4]). From the time of Epiphanius there can be little doubt that the book existed in a form very like what it at present bears. His references to Joachim, Mary's father; to the assigning of Mary by lot to Joseph, &c., make this out. The Hebraisms of style, and the many proofs of familiarity with Jewish custom and tradition, point to a Jewish or Ebionite author, probably an Ebionite Gnostic. There are anachronisms[5] which make this conclusion less than absolutely certain; but still it is probable. The name of James was popular among Jewish Christians, and some of them (Eus. H. E. III. 27) believed in the supernatural birth of Jesus from a virgin, as this book teaches. The Gnostic difficulty of believing Jesus to be sinless when He had a material body was removed a step backwards when the virgin mother was said to be a child of supernatural origin, and sinless. The purpose of the author was to buttress the marvellous facts of Christ's life by investing the birth of His mother with a kindred miraculous sanctity; and the book has been the parent of innumerable ecclesiastical traditions which, following an eastward course, have furnished the Koran with many legends relative to our Lord's birth and parentage; and in their west-

the Emperor (Claudius), and one to Tiberius (found in the Descent of Christ to the Dead); 17, 18. Anaphora Pilati; 19. Paradosis Pilati; 20. Death of Pilate; 21. Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea; 22. Vindicta Salvatoris.

[1] Thus the pseudo-Matthew and the Nativity of Mary seek to establish the descent of Mary from the tribe of Judah, and the sanctity of Joseph the carpenter. The clumsy forgery, No. 4 (in the list in the previous note), carries the greatness of Joseph much further, though not so far as the modern Church of Rome.

[2] There are two other passages in Justin with verbal coincidence—Apol. I. 33, Dial. c. 100.

[3] Clement (Strom. VII. 16, p. 890) separates himself from those who own the authority of the story by saying "φασί τινες." Jerome expressly disclaims all faith in there being midwives at Mary's delivery, and so sweeps away the story.

[4] Origen (Comment. in Mat., vol. iii. p. 463) sets the Gospels ascribed to Peter and to James on the same level.

[5] Such as the High Priest's plate, the Twelve Tribes still existing, the rejection of Joachim's gifts because he was childless, &c.

ern development have culminated in our own day in the authoritative promulgation, by Pope Pius IX., of the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.[1]

The *Gospel of Thomas*, containing a narrative of the life of Jesus from His fifth to His twelfth year, found in many forms—Greek, Latin, and Syriac, with very numerous variations—may perhaps date from the second century, and, at all events, contains curious incidents, to which reference is made by Irenæus[2] and others. Origen[3] and Eusebius speak of a Gospel of Thomas to condemn it, as also does the Decree of Gelasius. In this Gospel are found the well-known stories of miracles wrought by the child Jesus, such as making sparrows of clay, carrying water home in his garment, killing and reviving a harsh teacher, &c. They are childish freaks of omnipotence.

What is popularly called the *Gospel of Nicodemus* comes next; but under this title (which seems to date from the time of Charlemagne) two distinct works are combined:—

(1.) "*The Acts of Pilate*" is a brief title of what professes to be a memorial of what our Lord Jesus Christ did under Pontius Pilate, and is an expansion of the canonical narrative, especially of John's Gospel. The impotent man (John v. 5), and the blind man (John ix. 1), and a cripple and a leper, appear before Pilate to testify to Christ,[4] &c.

(2.) The "*Descent of Christ to the Under World*" professes to be an account by Simeon and his two sons of what took place when Christ, as King of Glory, burst open the gates of Hades, and bound Satan, and removed the saints of old time to a higher state of being. It is a noble poem, with a simple majesty surpassing all that Milton has sung, and free from the grotesqueness which detracts from the grandeur of Dante. But this—the second part of the "Gospel of Nicodemus"—is not so old as the first. The other books referring to Pilate in the apocryphal list are of little moment.[5]

[1] The Decree of Pope Pius IX., Dec. 8, 1854, was: "The doctrine that the most blessed Virgin Mary was preserved from all original sin in the very first moments of her conception by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, conferred upon her in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, has been revealed by God, and therefore must be firmly and constantly held by all the faithful."

[2] See Iren. Hær. B. I. 16, where he tells of the arithmetical marvels discovered in the alphabet by the Marcosians. He does not name the Gospel of Thomas as his authority, but it contains what he refers to.

[3] The reference in Hippolytus to the Gospel of Thomas, "Ἐμὲ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἑτῶν ἑπτὰ," gives a passage not in the book as we now have it.

[4] The name of Pilate's wife (Procla) is given; the woman with the issue of blood is called Veronica; the soldier who pierced Jesus' side is Longinus. Other traditions give this name to the centurion at the cross. The penitent thief, Dysmas, and his unbelieving comrade, Gestas, are also named.

[5] On the Acts of Pilate see pp. 174 (and note), 464, 465. Tischendorf's elaborate argument in favour of his position that this is the book Justin knew, fails to make out its existence in the third century. Eusebius does not say he had seen it.

We may further roughly group the lost apocryphal Gospels as—

I. *Gospels forged in the names of Apostles.*—Philip,[1] Bartholomew,[2] Andrew,[3] Peter,[4] Thomas,[5] Judas Thaddæus,[6] Judas Iscariot,[7] Matthias,[8] Barnabas,[9] the Twelve Apostles.[10]

II. *Gospels named after those who used them.*—The Gospels of the Hebrews, Nazarenes, Ebionites, Egyptians, come first under this head.[11]

[1] *Gospel of Philip.*—It is uncertain whether the Evangelist or Apostle was the professed author. The book was a collection of ascetic Gnostic traditions inculcating self-denial. Jesus is said to have taught Philip what the soul ought to say in ascending to heaven, and how to answer each one of the powers above. If any man had begotten children, he must wait below till he could take his children with him. See Epiph. Hær. 26, 13.

[2] *Bartholomew.*—Condemned by Gelasius. In his Pref. to Comment. on Mat. Jerome speaks of it, and condemns it as untrue. There is a story that Pantænus found Bartholomew in India, preaching the advent of the Lord Jesus according to Matthew's Gospel, and that Pantænus brought the Gospel of Matthew, written in Hebrew, back with him to Alexandria. (See text, p. 133.) It is possible that Bartholomew had written out Matthew's Gospel, and that his copy, with preface and alterations, after passing through various hands, was called the Gospel of Bartholomew by those who did not know its true history.

[3] *Andrew.*—Condemned by Gelasius. It is perhaps the apocryphal Acts of Andrew which came to bear the name of Andrew's Gospel.

[4] The *Gospel of Peter*, see p. 466.—Eusebius groups it with the Gospels of Thomas and Matthias as unworthy of regard. Some identify it with the Gospel of Basilides.

[5] *Gospel of Thomas.*—Besides the Gospel of the Infancy (to which reference is made), there was another Gospel of Thomas written by one of the twelve scholars of Manes (see p. 24). It was used by Gnostics and Manichees, and condemned by several Fathers. Some think—but not very probably—that the two books were the same.

[6] *Gospel of Judas Thaddæus.*—Condemned by Gelasius. It has been conjectured that the name is a mistake for Matthias.

[7] *Gospel of Judas Iscariot.*—As noticed on pp. 385, 386, note 1, this Gospel was full of hatred of the Jews and the Mosaic doctrines, and was in use among the Cainites. One of the primary principles of the sect was, that before a man could be saved he must make trial of every kind of vice.

[8] *Gospel of Matthias.*—No undoubted fragment of this often-mentioned Gospel remains. Several Gnostics founded upon writings ascribed to Matthias. Clem. Alex. (Strom. VII. 17, p. 900) names the followers of Valentinus, Marcion, and Basilides as doing so,—see also Hipp. Hær. VII. 20. The quotation of Clem. Alex. from the Traditions of Matthias on the duties of an elect person (text, p. 452) is probably from another book than the Gospel, if indeed it be from a book at all. Some suppose that a book of Matthias is one of those to which St Luke refers in the Preface to his Gospel. See Mill, Proleg. in N. T., § 53.

[9] *Gospel of Barnabas.*—Condemned by Gelasius. No trace of this Gospel remains. Some say Barnabas translated Matthew's original Hebrew into Greek. We are told, also, that his body was found with the Gospel of Matthew lying on his heart, written in his own hand. There is a curious Mohammedan imposture professing to be the Gospel of Barnabas. It tells of Jesus appearing to His mother and disciples to say that it was not He but Judas who had died on the cross, and that the name of Jesus would bear the reproach of a death of crucifixion until Mohammed appeared to deliver all believers from error.

[10] *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.*—This is supposed to be a name for the Gospel of the Hebrews in one of its many forms, and probably was the name used among the Jews of Palestine. See Kleuker, § 952.

[11] See under chapter x., p. lxviii.

Next we may enumerate the Gospels of the Encratites,[1] of the Manichees,[2] of the Valentinians,[3] of Basilides,[4] Apelles,[5] Cerinthus,[6] Simonians (or of Scythianus).[7]

III. *Harmonies.*—Tatian's Gospel, and those of Peter, Hesychius, and Lucian, have been already mentioned. They seem to have come under this head.

IV. *Miscellaneous.*—Gospel of Eve,[8] of Perfection,[9] of Seth,[10] [of Truth].[11]

The foregoing is a general list and classification of the apocryphal Gospels. The value of those books to the student of canonicity does not lie in their quotations from our canonical books, because all such quotations are subject to suspicion, owing to our uncertainty of the date of the apocryphal Gospels, and our certainty that they were much altered after their first composition. Some quotations are given in our text, and some have been indicated in the foregoing paragraphs. The apocryphal books are valuable because—

1. They imply the existence of the canonical books. They are in their very nature supplementary. They attempt to speak of what the New Testament does not tell: of the previous history of Mary, of the childhood of Jesus, of His life while His body was in Joseph's tomb,

[1] The Gospel of the Encratites ("the continent") is conjectured to have been Tatian's Diatessaron, because Tatian himself was an Encratite. But it may have been the Gospel of the Egyptians, which certainly favoured Encratite views.

[2] The Manichees used three books—Ζῶν Εὐαγγέλιον, Gospel of Thomas, and Gospel of Philip. The first was a Doctrine or Gospel of Life—the true Christian teaching, according to Manes.

[3] See p. 413 and note. The name of this book was the Gospel of Truth. It was a book of Jewish Theosophy, not intended as a substitute for our Gospels, but as a doctrinal treatise. See p. 70.

[4] See on the Exegetics of Basilides, pp. 389, 390, and notes. See also pp. 82, 99.

[5] Apelles was mentioned by Jerome and by Origen. On his book and his position generally see p. 430 and note.

[6] See on Cerinthus, p. 384, note.

[7] Scythianus was a predecessor of Manes. This book was a Manichæan Gospel, and was used by the Simonians (Photius). It was probably a statement of Manichæan doctrine, and contained a pretended narrative of our Lord's life. Scythianus wrote a "Book of the Four Quarters of the World," and its divisions were—1. The Gospel; 2. The Quintessence (κεφαλαία); 3. The Mysteries (the Old Testament); 4. The Treasures (the New Testament). See Kleuker, § 985.

[8] *Eve.*—Used by the Ophites, and pretending to be what the serpent taught the woman. See p. 386, note. (Epiph. Hær. 26.)

[9] *Perfection.*—Used by Gnostics. Some regard it as the same with the Gospel of Philip, or that of Basilides, or that of Eve. (See Epiph. Hær. 26.)

[10] *Seth.*—Used by some Syrian Gnostics: see p. 386, note. Seth was reported to have had divine beauty, and to have invented the Hebrew alphabet, and discovered the celestial signs. He is alleged to have planted a bough of the tree of life of which Moses got a branch in his miraculous rod.

[11] This was the Gospel of the Valentinians. See note 3 above.

and of other and similar subjects of curiosity. But they would be unintelligible if they stood alone. Considered in themselves, they are incapable of constituting the Scriptures of a religion. The Jesus of whom they tell is one well known and adored on the strength of other narratives which describe the object of His life and teaching. None of the three we have spoken of as the best of their kind could account for its own existence, if the Gospel of Jesus Christ as we have it in the canon were not presupposed. The existence of those apocrypha in the second century is a testimony to the older date, and the authority of our Gospels.[1]

They do not so explicitly as Clement of Rome or Polycarp disclaim all competition with the inspired writings, but they imply subordination in their whole texture.

2. The amazing discrepancies in the different MSS of the apocryphal Gospels are proof that men felt themselves at liberty to manipulate those books as they pleased. No sacred awe kept the hands of the copyist and the chronicler from adjusting them to suit his own views. No salvation was perilled on their veracity. Let them say what they might, it could not essentially alter the course of history. It is true that we have traced the Ebionite in one, the Marcosian in another: but while one man twisted the tradition in one direction, another twisted it in the very opposite, and all betray a consciousness that the books are but outworks from which the inner citadel of Christian Revelation may be assailed or protected. When a heretic of real power wished to make a heretical book the very Bible of his sect, he must, like Apelles or Marcion (or Basilides?), take some one of the four Gospels, and—either by dilution or abridgment—torture it to serve his purposes. The Gnostics were the chief parents of apocryphal writings, but the earliest Gnostics invented meanings and explanations of facts, not the facts themselves. Their books were essentially commentaries or essays, or philosophising upon acknowledged Scriptures.

But when some leader of a subdivision of one of the great heresies desired to distinguish himself, or to confirm in men's minds the notions of the school to which he belonged, he could do no better than issue a new or a revised apocryphal Gospel. It took up subjects omitted in the canonical books: it did not therefore come into direct competition with them; and the reader or hearer was not on the alert against such supplementary speculations. Among people predisposed to receive it, the book had therefore ready acceptance. In course of time another man manipulated the book for a slightly different purpose: if of another country, he translated it with such omissions or additions as he chose. Hence it is that we have in the extant apocry-

[1] See Iren. B. III. 1, quoted p. 67. ("Tanta est autem circa Evangelia hæc firmitas," &c.)

phal Gospels various recensions of which we are uncertain whether to speak as recensions or as different books. When we compare those divergencies—say in the Gospel of Thomas and the pseudo-Matthew, or the nativity of Mary—with the small points involved in the "disputed passages" of Scripture, we have an argument of real weight. In the one case the great changes show us that we have compositions which it was no one's business to protect from the editor's caprice; and in the other, from the anxiety to maintain the text, we see that we have books which all Christendom accepted so heartily, and guarded so faithfully, that it was not in an editor's power to make material alterations.

3. We may further and finally say, that wide as has been the influence of the apocryphal Gospels on Christian traditions and Christian art,[1] its nature was from the first such as to make it easy to understand how the names of the books perished from memory. There was usually nothing in the traditional incident to alarm a believer in Scripture, while the very name of the book as a pretender to canonical authority was reprobated. One can easily see how few Christians would care to quote or to acknowledge the books condemned in the Decree of Gelasius, and yet how easily the traditions they contained would be often embodied in sermons and works of art. When the canon was regarded as complete, the older apocryphal books naturally fell into disuse and were forgotten. Thus from the fourth century onwards there was an increasing disregard of the names of the once famous books, and from the sixth century they seem to have been forgotten. The Papal Church has persisted in this disregard of the books, while yielding more and more to the tendencies which they represent. It is the Protestant Church which has exhumed them, and Protestant theologians see most clearly their historical and apologetical value.

The apocryphal Acts are, with one exception, not so old or so important for our purpose. The full list of those given in Tischendorf's

[1] The great preachers of the fourth century systematically used the incidents of apocryphal history as ornaments of their sermons, and a similar use of them continues in the Unreformed Churches to the present day. The festivals of the Romish Church are full of the Apocrypha. The "descent into hell" is a prominent feature of the so-called Apostles' Creed. There is nothing more usual in lives of saints than power over wild beasts, such as is recorded in "Thomas," &c. Christian art abounds in still more numerous illustrations. Joseph is an old man, often holding a rod; sometimes he has a mitre; sometimes an ox and ass are near, adoring Christ. In Greek temples and monasteries, the annunciation is made while Mary is at the well with a pitcher. The birthplace of Jesus is painted as full of holy light streaming from the child. Though the crucified were naked, Jesus is always represented as having a linen cloth while on the cross, and with the crown of thorns. The stories of the Virgin's Death (which belong, however, to the Acts rather than to the Gospels) are often represented in Christian art. These are only specimens of the influence of the Christian Apocrypha. See Tischendorf, De Origine et Usu, &c.; and Nicolas, Études sur les Évangiles apocryphes.

collection is long: (1) Acts of Peter and Paul, (2) of Paul and Thecla, (3) of Barnabas, (4) of Philip, (5) of Philip in Hellas, (6) of Andrew, (7) of Andrew and Matthias, (8) Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew, (9) of Thomas, (10) Consummation of Thomas, (11) Acts of Bartholomew, (12) of Thaddeus, (13) of John. Of these, the Acts of Paul and Thecla (see note, p. 180) is the most important, and probably dates from the second century.[1] Some of its quotations are given in the text, p. 180, &c. It is superfluous to say that it testifies to the Pauline writings. But the narrative in its present form contains many things to which one naturally ascribes a date much later than the second century. There is not only inculcation of celibacy in the strongest terms, but prayers for the dead, a high view of the sacraments, and (in one version) laudation of relics.

This leads us to notice the distinctive feature of the apocryphal "Acts." Each book has a distinct purpose, which usually is to solve some knotty question of Church Discipline or Government. We know how many of the chief questions which emerge in the Church find their solution in St Luke's narrative: and those uncanonical books seek to occupy similar ground with Luke. The position of women in the Church is evidently before the mind of the author of "Paul and Thecla," and he seeks to secure that it shall be a prominent one. Celibacy is greatly glorified in the same book. The "seal," as it is called, of the Sacrament, is much prized. In the Acts of Thomas, baptism with oil is treated as a royal chrism; and Gnostic mysticism is greatly enhanced in the accompanying incantations or prayers. The Acts of Barnabas teach that "orders" are indelible: the Acts of John that Christ's humanity was a semblance. Some of the books have an ethical purpose: in the Acts of Philip we have a powerful warning against revenge; in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias the cruelty of the unregenerate human heart is expounded.

But, on the whole, the purpose of each book is to show—not like St Luke's narrative, how the Gospel of Jesus Christ was brought to bear on Jew and Gentile, on the mob, or on the potentate, but—how some special, even minor, point was the burden of an Apostle's teaching and labour. In this the Apocrypha betray their later origin. The central Christian doctrine is taken for granted; men's minds are full of some detail. Miracles have become portents or trials of strength—are no longer subordinate agencies in the inculcation of spiritual truth. The interest of each narrative also is usually limited and local, not universal. Certainly no one of them ever gained—possibly none ever sought—the regard of the Church of Christ as a whole.

[1] See details in Tischendorf's Prolegomena to his edition of the Acts, p. xxiii; or in Jones on the Canon, vol. ii. p. 326. Jerome says the baptism of a lion was narrated in this book. This is not in the copy which we have. This has thrown doubt on the antiquity of the work in its present form.

In the second century there was a famous collection of apocryphal Acts by Leucius Charinus (see text, p. 25), who seems to have been a Gnostic, somewhat after the fashion of Marcion. His book, known as *αἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων περίοδοι*, contained Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul (so Photius). It is doubtful whether the extant "Acts" were ever portions of that book, which seems to have had some internal unity. Zahn (Acta Joannis, p. cxlii) dates "Leucius" in A.D. 130.[1]

There is an apostolical history in ten books ascribed to Abdias, Bishop of Babylon. It is a clumsy forgery, probably not earlier than the sixth century,—certainly not earlier than the fifth.[2]

The apocryphal EPISTLES—such as Laodiceans, the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Philippians (see p. 209, note), the letter of Jesus to Abgar (Eus. H. E. I. 13), and the letters ascribed to Pilate (noticed above)—are also to be passed with simple mention. The letters of Paul to Seneca are an interesting forgery (see p. 209). The student of Church History may be interested in Eusebius's strong statements regarding the correspondence of Jesus with Abgar.

The apocryphal APOCALYPSES of the New Testament do not fill so important a place in the history of criticism, or in doctrinal controversy, as do some of the Apocalypses of the Old Testament.[3] The Apocalypse of Paul professes to utter what Paul had seen: the Apocalypse of John reads like a travesty of the canonical book, the chief point of interest being recognition of each other in the future state of the good: "Mary's falling asleep" has in it, in several versions, substantially the same story of all the Apostles being brought from their various scenes of labour, even the dead from their graves. Passing by the others, we may mention the Assumption of Moses,[4] which professes to be a charge by Moses to Joshua, and ends abruptly. Some critics believe that if we had it all, we should have the passage which Jude quoted; and an incident to which Clem. Alex. refers (Strom. VII. 15), when he represents Joshua as seeing Moses double,—one part ascending with the angels, one buried in the earth. Nay, they find that Moses was the original of the phœnix,—his mortal part falling to the earth, his immortal part rising to the skies. All this is pure hypothesis, though it has attracted the clear mind of Hilgenfeld.[5]

[1] See Fabricius, p. 970, and Kleuker, p. 1027, for what may have been another book by Leucius (called "Leontius"). Zahn's interesting arguments in behalf of the fragments on John are insecure. He considers them fatal to the idea that there ever was a Presbyter John. If his arguments hold good, there is a new link in the proof of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. See Zahn, p. cxlviii.

[2] The author uses the Vulgate and Rufinus's translation of the Clem. Recogn.

[3] See on Old Testament Apocalypses, Dillmann in Herzog's Encyclop., p. 306, &c.

[4] Fabricius published some fragments; in 1861 at Milan there was found a fuller work, 'Fragmenta Assumptionis Moses.'

[5] See his Nov. Test. ex. Can. Rec.

XVII.—THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

It is perhaps superfluous to make any comments upon the testimonies to the fourth Gospel in the text of this work; but as that Catena contains nearly all the citations on which stress has ever been laid in the controversy of about half a century, it may be useful to the student to have a few notes on what are really the most important points.

The Catena contains not a little which will not bear much pressure; but it also contains materials from which a strong chain may be constructed. If Papias "used testimonies" found in the first Epistle of John, and if the Presbyters[1] who were his contemporaries quoted from the Gospel, we have the earliest possible evidence for the existence and authority of the Johannine writings. For Papias was a "hearer of John" (Irenæus), perhaps lived with him (see Anast. Sin. on p. 59). See the Note on John at Ephesus, p. xlv.

We may be certain that Barnabas used the fourth Gospel. It scarcely needs Keim's powerful argument to this effect; the passages themselves make it pretty clear. There remains, of course, the question as to the date of Barnabas; and I do not think it can be put in the first century, but it can scarcely have been later than twenty or thirty years after John's death.

The expressions in Clement of Rome are too vague, and those in Ignatius of too uncertain date, to warrant our founding upon them. But it is not possible to pass over the clear words of Polycarp; and the theology and the tone of Hermas remind us of the fourth Gospel with a perpetual suggestiveness which isolated quotations cannot adequately represent.

Turning from the direct line of the Church, we have Basilides, A.D. 125, whose words seem proved to be those we find in Hippolytus. About the Clementine Homilies, there can no longer be any doubt as regards distinct quotation, now that Dressel has discovered the complete MS with the words of John ix. 20 emphatically used. There may well be raised the question of the date of this book, but it is rather strange to find doubt of its antiquity and value among those who impugn the fourth Gospel! All that the Tübingen scholars said of the great importance of the Clementines before Dressel's publication in 1853 is

[1] Even if we do not follow Routh in regarding the "Presbyters" as meaning Papias in this case (and I regret having put it so in the text), the date of the testimony quoted by Irenæus remains the same. See pp. 71, 72 of our text, and notes. Compare Routh's notes, Rel. Sac., pp. 17, 31, in which it is not clear whether Routh meant Papias or the authorities on whom Papias relied.

turned against them, now that the book witnesses for the Gospel they assailed. The Acts of Pilate has been so freely used by its copyists or possessors, that—like other apocryphal books—it is an insecure witness; and, while it may be mentioned, it cannot be pressed. The same is true of the Acts of John. See *supra*, p. cvii.

There are few things made more clear of late than the rightful enrolment of Justin Martyr among the witnesses for John's Gospel. There has been a growing appreciation of this fact, and the latest authors are the most explicit.[1]

That Heracleon and Ptolemæus must be reckoned on the same side cannot be doubted. And the date of Heracleon makes the devotion of that learned Gnostic to John, as to a text-book, very significant. In this devotion he was not exceptional among his fellows. The earliest Gnostics in the second century give us not only quotations from the Gospel of John, and the first commentary upon it, but in the key-notes of their various systems (Marcion excepted) we find indubitable proofs of its influence. The ordinary teachers followed in the track of the Synoptists, but the Gnostics took up, in imitation of the fourth Gospel, those great problems of the relations of the Spiritual God and fallen man, of light and darkness, of life and death, of the world and the believer, of spirit and the body, which John has made so prominent.

The Muratorian fragment is as explicit as it can be. When we pass the middle of the century, and come to the works of Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus (with a quotation by name), we are out of the region of controversy.[2] At the same time we are bound to remember in this connection that the evidence of Irenæus is not fairly estimated if we think of his date alone. The weight of what he says comes from his direct connection with John through Polycarp. It is inconceivable that one so learned and so intelligent could be mistaken in believing that his beloved master Polycarp was the disciple of the beloved Apostle of Jesus Christ.[3] Yet this is the paradox which Keim[4] set himself to establish, in attempting to overturn the long-accepted tradition of the Church, and to prove that the Apostle John was never in Ephesus. There is some examination of this elsewhere (see p. xlv). We may here note that he fixed the date of the Gospel at A.D. 110-117, and we may agree with Dr Samuel Davidson in his quaint confession that "Keim's date, A.D. 110-117, under Trajan, makes it exceedingly difficult to disprove Johannine authorship."[5]

[1] In Dr Sanday's book on the Gospels, to which I so often refer, is an able argument; and Professor Drummond's article (see p. 178) strikes me as singularly conclusive.

[2] The uncertain date of Celsus detracts from the value of his testimony, but it is not to be overlooked (see p. 375).

[3] See in page 182. In the first passage from Irenæus (B. III. 3, 4), the αὐτοῦ is Polycarp, who is the authority for the anecdote.

[4] Anticipated by Lützelberger, who ascribed the authorship of the Gospel to Andrew; to some extent by Wittichen. See on Keim's withdrawal, p. vi. note 2.

[5] Davidson, Introduction to New Testament, vol. ii. p. 426.

The natural conclusion from this rapid review is that we have as early, if not as numerous, proofs of the existence of John's Gospel as of the existence of the Synoptists; and that in the whole stream of Christian thought during the second century, we have more indubitable proofs of its influence than of the influence of any other single book of the New Testament. This is the testimony of the Church and of the Heretics—given with a unanimity which is impressive. And what is there on the other side? There are said to have been some individuals in the end of the second century who refused to accept this book because of the unpalatable nature of its teaching regarding the Holy Spirit, and Epiphanius tells us of a sect or party in Lybia excited to opposition. They were not numerous, nor were they powerful; they did not rely on any external evidence; they are chiefly memorable because of the happy nickname (Ἄλογοι or Alogi) by which Epiphanius (who is very proud of it) hit them off as "irrational," as well as rejecters of the Gospel of the Logos or Word of God.

From the second century until quite a recent date, scarcely a voice was ever lifted against the Johannine authorship. Luther was content to give up the rest of the New Testament if he had John, Romans, and 1 Peter. Schleiermacher, and all whom he influenced, held by this Gospel as the most precious spiritual teaching in Scripture. But a change came about sixty years ago. The solitary scholar (Bretschneider) who (1820) advanced among critical "probabilities" the idea that the book was not written by John, but by some other critic in the beginning or middle of the second century, was met with such firm opposition that he published his recantation of his suggested doubts. But his views were, nevertheless, soon after maintained by Strauss, and since his 'Life of Jesus' was published (1834-35), the fourth Gospel has been the battle-ground of criticism. A much greater Würtemberger than Strauss—F. C. Baur—maintained that the Gospel was written and started into great popularity about A.D. 160. He ascribed the popularity to the fact that the author had something to say that suited everybody,—one party of heretics finding their views of the Holy Spirit, another their cosmogony, another their opinions on the Paschal controversy, while Paul's followers found their master's principles carried out further and more fully than by themselves, and the whole Catholic Church rejoiced in the exposition of Christianity as the one absolute religion. In all this Baur did not take into account that every party would have been sure to denounce the new book for what it contained contrary to their special tenets. But, moreover, the sufficient answer is the proof that the Gospel was actually in use long before the time at which he supposes it to have been written. Keim pushed it back to the days of Trajan, and all Christian tradition (see Irenæus on p. 183) vouches for John's surviving till that reign. There is no possibility of a book claiming to be John's being written by some one else, and

palmed off upon the Church as his. There would have risen up a host of eager disciples to deny that their revered master ever wrote the book.

Thus much may be said on the external evidence and the history of the controversy.

But in course of the controversy men's minds have turned to the contents of the Gospel, and have analysed them with microscopic care.[1] Though it does not fall within the plan of this book to deal at any length with this aspect of the question, it may not be out of place to indicate briefly what appear to be some results of the discussion.

1. One result has been to dispose of the idea that the book was written by a secretary (even though Weizsäcker (1864) and Ewald (1861) lend it their support), or by a committee of John's congregation, or by any other than an *eye-witness*. In the first chapter, the passing over of the disciples from the Baptist to Jesus, and the many minute notes of time (vv. 35, 39, 43), are recorded as by one who was recalling the most memorable events of his own youth. The minute remembrance of time and detailed incidents, and the familiar acquaintance with the home and haunts of those whom he mentions (as of Philip in i. 43), are seen throughout the book. See the time of the marriage, and the number of firkins (ii. 1, 6); the parenthetical mention of the other boats (vi. 23); the apparently superfluous naming of Ephraim (xi. 54); the minute account of the coming of the Greeks, though no notice is taken of the direct result of their application (xii. 20); the many little touches of association with John the Baptist (vi. 59, x. 40); the spot of each of two notable incidents (viii. 20, x. 23), &c. When such things as these meet our eye, we see the eye-witness himself mingling little details which have no significance, except that he did remember them, with the momentous portions of his narrative; but we do not see things which it would occur to a reporter to record, or which, indeed, it would be natural for him to keep in mind. These little touches establish the truth of the Evangelist's claim: "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us: and we beheld His glory;" or in the beginning of his first Epistle (for it cannot be doubted that the same man wrote it), "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

The remarkable sketches of character are evidently the work of one who had known in daily intercourse the men and women of whom he writes. We come to know Andrew and Philip and Nathanael and Thomas, as well as we know Peter through the other evangelists; and of Peter himself we learn also much that is new and touching. Martha

[1] Reference may be made to the commentaries of Meyer, Godet, Luthardt, Lange, Watkins, Westcott, and to Weizsäcker's "Untersuchungen" (1864), Wittichen's 'Der geschichtliche Character des Evangeliums Johannis' (1868), and his 'Leben Jesu' (1876), and to Dr Sanday's 'Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel' (1872). In this book Dr Sanday has gathered all that was said before him, and has fused it in a new treatise with much that is his own. In the paragraphs given in these pages, I am most indebted to Wittichen and Weizsäcker.

and Mary, and Mary of Magdala, acquire a new distinctness of outline. The character of Nicodemus, in his progress towards the truth, and that of Pilate, who seems to tremble and hesitate even when he is fixed on the historic canvas, are sketched with the conscious power of a close observer of them both.

In the same connection we may notice the touches of autobiography. The continued notice of the Baptist has been often pointed out as showing that the writer was one of the two disciples who passed over from him to Jesus (i. 37). It is said that, after the fall of Jerusalem, some of John the Baptist's disciples aimed at being a permanent sect, and that this Gospel, by one of themselves, was written to remind them of their master's real relation to the Redeemer of men. In this Gospel he is only called "John." Others might need to distinguish him from the son of Zebedee; but when that son of Zebedee himself was writing, he did not think of there being two of the name. And the Evangelist is evidently one of the disciples whose slowness of heart he sorrowfully recalls (xvi. 17; ii. 17-22). The scenes at the successive meetings after the Resurrection are so described as to show indirectly the character and position of the writer.

2. We see further that the author was a *Jew of Palestine*. His whole tone of thought is formed on the Old Testament. That Hebrew of Hebrews, Paul himself, was not more a Hebrew than this writer. The Old Testament is the law (vii. 19), and also a prophecy of Christ (v. 29-46). The figures and types of the Old Testament are more constantly reproduced in this Gospel than in any other book of the New Testament save the Apocalypse. Jesus is the true temple (ii. 19), the true brazen serpent (iii. 14), the good Shepherd (x. 11), the true manna, the living water, the Paschal lamb. Only one who had breathed the atmosphere of Israel could have told, as this evangelist tells, how the coming of Messiah was the centre of all Jewish thought. He is at home in Jewish customs and arrangements, domestic, sacred, and national (vii. 37, x. 22, xix. 31), and in Jewish ritual and the controversies which sprang from it (iii. 25, vii. 22). No other writer has so sharply limned the religious condition of the ruling party in Israel, with "their ossified learning and their raw realism" (Wittichen), their fanatical theory and inconsistent practice (vii. 34, vii. 15, viii. 32, iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 32, &c.) He has walked on the roads and been tossed on the seas of Palestine, and his step is easy and sure when he is guiding his readers among them (iv. 6, xi. 18, vi. 19-21). His simple sentences, and his repetition of thought, show that "in the style of John the clothing alone is Greek, the body is Hebrew."[1] None but one who was a Jew, as well as an eye-witness, could have entered into the very soul of the nation, so as to represent all the various types of national

[1] See on this subject Wittichen, 'Der geschichtliche Character des Evangeliums Johannis' for very full details. The phrase in the text is Godet's.

character in the dramatic dialogues which are so frequent in the book. The Baptist, Nicodemus, Nathanael, the blind man, the priests in the temple, describe themselves in a few words.

3. Further, the author, though a Jew, was an *enlightened disciple of Christ.* The Jews are still the flock of God, but Christ has other sheep not of that fold. "He died not for that nation only." "Salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth (iv. 22, 23). For 1800 years we have been advancing into the meaning of those words; and even now we are only learning how much they mean.

It is thus that the use of the term "the Jews" is to be explained. As he looks back, the disciple sees that it was on account of misguided national feeling the opposition to his Master was so intense and so prolonged; and the most prominent features before his mind, as he recalls the Incarnate Son of God in Israel, are on the one hand Jesus endeavouring to exalt the nation, and on the other hand the great mass of that nation—the Jews—blindly resisting Him. This is strikingly brought out (vii. 35) when the Jews are amazed at the idea of His leaving Jerusalem to teach His brethren scattered among the heathen, and with scorn suggest the supremely ridiculous idea, that He would perhaps even teach the Greeks! "He came unto His own (τὰ ἴδια), and His own (οἱ ἴδιοι) received Him not."[1]

4. This leads us to notice *the calm authority* with which the Evangelist writes. I confess to being unable to doubt that the writer had a full knowledge of the synoptic narratives. The very first chapter, with its sudden introduction of both Messiah and the Baptist, would be unintelligible unless on the supposition that readers of his Gospel were already familiar with the synoptic writers. But when he had them before him, nothing but a full persuasion of his independent right to speak could have led him to make a book so unlike theirs. There is an evident and intentional supplementing of the other narratives at the outset (iii. 24), for they begin the ministry of Jesus at the time when John was cast into prison (Mark i. 14). He explains them sometimes. The words, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . *how often*," &c. (Mat. xxiii. 37), suggest the repeated visits of which he alone tells us. He sometimes needs them to explain his narrative: thus he alludes to many miracles, and to crowds that came, though of those miracles he has not said a word before (ii. 23, iv. 45, x. 37, xii. 37, &c.) In simple consciousness of a right to speak, he sets himself to add to what men already knew of that life which he had seen.

5. He writes with a *definite purpose.* There has been much controversy as to what that purpose was. But he has told us; and his own words characterise his Gospel as one might expect that they would

[1] He speaks of "your law" (viii. 17, x. 34) to remind them how impossible it was for them to disown the authority to which He appealed.

(xx. 31). He reports what will show that Jesus was the Incarnate Son of God. We know that at the end of the first century this was a needed counteractive of prevailing tendencies to error.

A very old tradition (Clem. Alex., see p. 75) says that John saw in the synoptic narratives the body of the Gospel, and that he wished to show its spirit. And this is true. He assumes that Christ's life is already known: but he writes for a Church which could now "bear" more than when the truth was first spoken and written.

It thus came to pass that he made incidents subordinate to speeches. We are not told directly what was the effect on Nicodemus of the interview by night,—the teaching regarding salvation by regeneration engrossing the writer's thoughts. Neither are we told whether the Greeks who came to see Jesus did see and hear Him,—the attention of the writer being fixed on the Saviour's doctrine of self-sacrifice. It is as though the ordinary incidents were sufficiently known, while comparatively little had been heard of the Saviour's higher teaching.

For it is higher teaching, and therefore parables almost entirely disappear. The Synoptists tell us, that while those who were low in the spiritual scale could not understand more than the parables, the disciples heard in private the explanation of those parables. Almost all the discourses in the fourth Gospel are addressed either to instructed Jews or to sympathising disciples. If we compare the fourth chapter of this Gospel with the explanation of the sower and of the tares in Mat. xiii., we find a wonderful resemblance. The parable in both cases becomes a metaphor worked into direct teaching and statement. In some other cases in the fourth Gospel where ordinary hearers were addressed, the circumstances at once suggested and explained the figures which Christ employed. Thus it was as natural to speak to Paschal pilgrims (chap. vi.) of food provided by God, as to tell the woman by the well (chap. iv.) of living water.

If, then, the author of the fourth Gospel was an eye-witness of the scenes he describes, and describes them so as to give us incidentally his autobiography;—if we learn from his narrative that he was a Jew of Palestine, and an enlightened disciple of Christ; if we see that he writes as one possessed of independent authority, and writes with a definite purpose; if we further learn that he was a favoured disciple of Jesus, who wrote after the other narratives had been for some time in the possession of the Church,—we are shut up to the conclusion that he was John, the son of Zebedee, who survived the other Apostles, and lived until the truth was menaced by errors which this Gospel was written to counteract. This is in accordance with the old belief of the Church, as was proved by the Catena of external evidence.

There are, however, some other points which we can best notice in connection with the ordinary objections to this conclusion. It is said that—

(α) "The discourses are longer in the fourth Gospel than in the others." But this is not so. The Sermon on the Mount, and the last address to the general crowd of auditors,—both found in St Matthew,—are longer than the discourses in our Gospel. The real difference lies in the greater number of incidents recorded by the Synoptists.

(β) "The doctrine taught is different." But the difference is only in detail and fulness. The whole doctrine of John as to the mystery of the relations of Father and Son is contained in Mat. xi. 25-30. And the closing counsels recorded by John before the Redeemer's death may be found condensed in Mat. xxviii. 18.

(γ) "The form of Christ's speeches is not the same." It is true that in the Synoptists they are usually brief, pointed, epigrammatic; in John usually (not always) expanded and more connected. This may partly come from the fact that the Synoptists describe the home life and the teaching in Galilee, while John records the intercourse with doctors in Jerusalem, and with instructed disciples. But I think that there is another consideration of more importance. It is admitted by every one that in all the Gospels all the discourses are much abridged. But how do men give to others a fair idea of what a speaker says when they do not give all he said? There are two ways. One is, to report *verbatim* portions or passages of his address; the other is, to give an outline of the whole without any one sentence being fully reproduced, though every expression may be (not necessarily is) what the speaker used. Now the Synoptists report by extract, John reports in outline.

(δ) "The doctrine of the Logos is peculiar to John." But that doctrine is confined to the Preface. It is avowedly the historian's own.

(ε) "The Greek of the fourth Gospel is pure." It is. But John was never a poor man; he had a house in Jerusalem, and must have been accustomed to speak Greek in the capital all his days.[1] His Greek is easy and natural; but it is the Greek of an educated Hebrew. It is less Hebrew than the Apocalypse; but on the supposition of common authorship, the interval between the writing of the two works had been spent in the Greek city of Ephesus. Cato at 80 learned Greek, and Plutarch almost as late in life learned Latin. (See Disraeli's 'Curiosities of Literature,' vol. i. p. 98). Jerome acquired Hebrew after he was 30; and David Livingstone learned a wild tongue in Africa, and forgot his own, after he had passed middle age.

[1] See Caspari, 'Chronologisch-geographische Einleitung;' and Dr Roberts's 'Discussions,' or his more recent, 'The Bible of our Lord.'

(ε) "John never names himself as the author." It is true; but there can be little doubt that he describes himself as the "disciple whom Jesus loved." All we learn of the fragrant old age of John in Ephesus[1] makes it likely that this descriptive title had become a proper name of the venerable saint, and it was only natural that he should use it to add authority to his great and final testimony to the Master on whose bosom he had lain. Sometimes one thinks that the egotism of the ambitious spirit that had once asked, or prompted his mother to ask, the distinction of sitting with his brother on either hand of the Lord when He came into His kingdom, had been mellowed into the old man's delight in claiming,—as he did claim, and that with truth,—when he looked back through seventy years to the life of Jesus of Nazareth, that it was he who had been nearest and dearest of all to the Heart that was broken by the world's sorrow and sin. If this be still egotism, it is not the less a touch of human nature which makes us feel John to be of our kindred. There was only One in whom was no fault at all.

(ζ) "The Jesus of the fourth Gospel is not the same as He of whom the Synoptists tell." I think the best answer to this is found in the witness of Christendom through all the centuries. All believing men have felt that the four narratives describe one life—that of the "God-Man" (Origen). The Church of Christ was not built on an abstraction, or on an idea, but on a Personal Saviour whom it has known through each one of the four Gospels. And the Church has always recognised that the Saviour must have been such a One as the fourth Gospel describes,—dwelling in a light and in a shadow which never rested on any other.

[1] The story of the young robber, and the closing charge to his scholars to love one another, are illustrations.

Analytical and Chronological Index of most important Witnesses to the Time of Jerome.

*** *The small Roman numerals refer to the Introduction; the Arabic figures to the Text.*

Writer.	Date.	Works Extant, and Remarks.	New Testament Books used.	Page.
Barnabas.	c. 119 or 120 A.D.	An Epistle.	Mat., Luke, John, Heb., 1 and 2 Tim.	i-vii, 102, 168, 255, 262.
Clement.	c. 90-100 A.D.	One genuine Epistle.	Synoptists, indications of John, Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., 1 Tim., Titus, Heb., James, 1 Peter.	viii-xxiv, 104-106, 170, 222, 272.
Hermas.	c. 142 A.D.	An Allegory called "The Shepherd."	Coincidences with the language and teaching of Mat., Luke, John, Acts, James, 1 Peter, Apocalypse.	xxiv - xxvi, 108, 175, 336.
Ignatius.	c. 107 or 115 A.D.	Seven Letters, perhaps genuine.	Mat., John, 1 Cor., Eph., Phil., 1 Thess.	xxvi - xxxiii, 110, 171, 224.
Polycarp.	c. 140-155 or 166 A.D.	An Epistle to the Philippians.	Mat., Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., 1 and 2 Tim., 1 Peter, 1 John.	xxxiii-xl, 112, 257, 304, 320.
Papias.	fl. 70-150 A.D.	Fragments in Eusebius.	Mat., Mark, 1 Peter, 1 John, Apocalypse, and traces of acquaintance with John's Gospel.	xli-xlvi, 53, 167.
Basilides.	c. 125 A.D.	Passages in Hippolytus, Epiphanius, &c.	Mat., Luke, John, Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Eph., Col., 1 Peter.	xlvii-liii, 173, 389.
Marcion.	c. 135-142 A.D.	Large passages in Tertullian and Epiphanius, and references in Justin and Irenæus.	His Canon comprised a mutilated Luke; ten Epistles of Paul, also mutilated — viz., Gal., 1 and 2 Cor., Rom., 1 and 2 Thess., Eph., Col., Philemon, Philip.	liv, 75, 154, 393 (note). See his Gospel, 393-410, 75 (note).

Writer.	Date.	Works Extant, and Remarks.	New Testament Books used.	Page.
Valentinus.	c. 140-160 A.D.	Passages in Irenæus and Hippolytus.	*Integrum Instrumentum*—probably the complete Canon—clear references to Mat., Luke, John, Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., Heb., and 1 John.	liv, 413-419, 413 (note).
Heracleon.	Not later than A.D. 160.	...	Mat., Luke, John, Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Tim., with commentary on John.	419-422.
Ptolemæus.	Not later than A.D. 160.	...	Mat., Mark, John, Rom., Cor., Gal., Eph., Col.	422-424.
Clement's Second Epistle.	c. 120-140 A.D.	Really a Homily.	Probable use of Mat. and Luke, and of Epistles to Eph. and Tim. (Apparent use of uncanonical writings.)	xviii, 106.
Clementine Homilies, Recognitions, Epitome.	c. 160 A.D.	An Ecclesiastical or Doctrinal Romance.	The four Gospels. (Uncanonical allusions.)	lxiii, 184, 438-444.
Justin Martyr.	c. 139-146 A.D.; died A.D. 148.	Two Apologies, and Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew.	The four Gospels and Apocalypse, incidental correspondence with Rom., 1 Cor., Col., 2 Thess., Heb. (Uncan. allus.)	liii-lxiii, 59, 114, 143, 156, 176, 217, 337.
Tatian.	c. 170 A.D.	Allusions in Eusebius, &c., and Address to the Greeks.	Diatessaron, probably a Harmony of the four Gospels. In Address John, possibly Mat., Rom., 1 Cor.	liv, 72, 180, 219, 227, 72 (note).
Hegesippus.	c. 177 A.D.	Fragments in Eusebius.	Mat., Luke, probable allusions to language and sense of Pastoral Epistles.	77, 127.
Athenagoras.	c. 177 A.D.	An Apology, and Tract on the Resurrection.	Mat., John, Rom., Gal., 1 and 2 Cor.	131, 181, 228.

Writer.	Date.	Works Extant, and Remarks.	New Testament Books used.	Page.
Theophilus.	c. 180-193 A.D.	Treatise addressed to Autolycus.	Mat., Luke, John, Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Eph., Philip., Col., 1 Tim., Titus, also Heb., and 1 Peter.	73, 182, 259, 73 (note).
The Syriac (Peshito) Version.	The second century.	...	All, except Apocalypse, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.	1, 2.
The Old Latin Version.	The second century.	...	All, except Heb., 2 Peter, and probably James.	2.
Muratorian Canon.	c. 160 or 170 A.D.	...	Directly and by inference the four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, two, perhaps three, Epp. of John, Jude, Apocalypse, Epp. of James and Peter not mentioned, and no certain ref. to Heb. (Apoc. of Peter).	lxxix, 3-8.
The Churches of Vienne & Lyons.	c. 177 A.D.	An Epistle, preserved by Eusebius.	Coincidences of expression with Luke, John, Acts, and most of the Epistles of St Paul, also 1 Peter, 1 John, and Apocalypse.	158.
Celsus.	c. 178 A.D.	Portions of a polemical Treatise against Christianity as discussed by Origen.	The four Gospels, possible traces of acquaintance with St Paul.	369 (note).
Irenæus.	c. 140-202 A.D.	Treatise against heresies.	The four Gospels, Acts, twelve Epistles of Paul, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, Apocalypse; Philemon not named, Heb. not acknowledged.	lxxxvii, cix, 45, 66.
Clement of Alexandria.	c. 189-219 A.D.	Several Treatises.	All, except James, 2 Peter, and 3 John, which are not recognised, and Philem. not named.	lxxxi-lxxxiii, 50, 74, 277.

Writer.	Date.	Works Extant, and Remarks.	New Testament Books used.	Page.
Tertullian.	c. 160-220 or 240 A.D.	Many large Treatises.	All, except James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.	46, 75, 278, 46 (note).
Origen.	c. 184-253 A.D.	Several large Treatises and Commentaries.	Four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, Heb., 1 Peter, 1 John, Apocalypse, James, and Jude; 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John are doubtful.	lxxxiii-lxxxv, 8, 9, 51, 52, 81.
Dionysius of Alexandria.	c. 247-265 A.D.	Fragments of Letters, (Routh's Rel. Sac., vol. iii. p. 223), and allusions in Eusebius.	The whole Canon, but ascribing the Apocalypse to another than the Apostle John.	86, 345, 86 (note).
Eusebius.	c. 270-340 A.D.	Ecclesiastical History, and minor works.	Christian books in three classes. Acknowledged, four Gospels, Acts, Epp. of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, Apocalypse (perhaps); disputed, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John; spurious, Apocalypse, apparently, and many Apocryphal writings.	16, 87, 207, 10 (note).
Athanasius.	c. 329-373 A.D.	Festal Letters and greater works.	All our Canonical books.	13 (note).
Cyril of Jerusalem.	Died 386 A.D.	Various works.	All, save the Apocalypse.	19 (note).
Epiphanius.	c. 367-403 A.D.	Treatises on heresies.	A Canon exactly ours.	21, 95 (note).
Chrysostom.	Died 407 A.D.	Commentaries and Sermons.	All, except that he never cites the Apocalypse, nor Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.	23.
Augustine.	c. 354-430 A.D.	Commentaries, and many other works.	The Received Canon, doubting authorship of Heb.	22, 22 (note).
Jerome.	c. 329-420 A.D.	Commentaries, and various Treatises.	The Received Canon.	21, 99.

N.B.—The above Index is an extension and adaptation of the useful Index given by Dr Sanday, 'The Gospels in the Second Century,' pp. 382-384.

CANONICITY.

I.

OLDEST TESTIMONIES TO A COLLECTION OF SACRED CHRISTIAN BOOKS.

1. The Syriac Version (Peshito).

The Peshito (or 'simple') version of the Scripture seems to have been from a very early age in common use throughout the regions where Syriac was spoken. Notices in the New Testament show that Antioch was at the first one of the most important centres of Christian influence; and that the organising power of the faith in Jesus so bound together the community of believers in that city as to lead to their receiving the distinctive name of Christians (Acts xi. 19. 26). The early legend of Abgar, Toparch of Edessa, writing to Jesus Christ and receiving an answer with the promise of an Apostle's visit (Eus. H. E. I. 13), shows how soon the Gospel was understood to have taken root in those regions. It is now generally believed that at least from the second century until the present day there has been used by Syriac-speaking Christians that version of the N. T. which is known as the Peshito. Scattered and hostile Churches have the same book: MSS of all ages contain it in substantially

the same form. Its list of Books is the same as our present Canon, save that it wants the Apocalypse, Jude, 2 Peter, and 2 & 3 John. This may be regarded as the Testimony of the Syrian Church in the second century.[1]

2. The Old Latin Version

is also of very remote antiquity. It was the Bible of the large and vigorous African Church. It appears in the writings of the Translator of Irenaeus. It had been so long current before Tertullian's time that its phrases moulded popular speech and Christian thought in his day. The translation of *λόγος* in John's Gospel by *Sermo* was a proof of its rude simplicity which rather distressed him. Its Canon did not originally contain Hebrews (though it had been enriched by it before Tertullian's time); 2 Peter was also wanting; and the testimony of the greater part of the MSS is to the effect that James was not in it.[2] This therefore is the testimony of the African Church of the second century. While the Roman Church was using Greek, the African shores of the Mediterranean were inhabited by a Latin-speaking Christian people whose Canon was (save as regards Hebrews, 2 Peter, and probably James) the same as our own.

[1] See Scrivener, Int. to Crit. of N. T. p. 273. Even those who claim for the Curetonian Syriac an earlier date than they accord to the Peshito, admit that a Syriac version did exist in the second century. Melito quotes an O. T. as ὁ Σύρος (see Mill, Proleg. CXXVII.), and Euseb. H. E. IV. 22 says that Hegesippus ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τίθησιν.

[2] Tischendorf names 2 Codd. containing James.

3. Muratorian Canon.

(*Text according to Tregelles.*[1])

quibus tamen Interfuit et ita posuit.

TERTIO EUANGELII LIBRUM SECUNDO LUCAN

Lucas Iste medicus post ascensum XPI.
Cum eo Paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum.
Secundum adsumsisset numeni suo
ex opinione concriset dūm tamen nec Ipse
duidit in carne et idē pro asequi potuit.
Ita et ad natiuitate Iohannis incipet dicere.
QUARTI EUANGELIORUM IOHANNIS EX DECIPOLIS
cohortantibus condescipulis et ēps suis
dixit conieiunate mihi· odie triduo et quid
cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum
nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue
latum andreae ex apostolis ut recognis
centibus cuntis Iohannis suo nomine
cuncta discribret et ideo licit uaria sin
culis euangeliorum libris principia
doceantur Nihil tamen differt creden
tium fedei cum uno ac principali spū de
clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui
tate de passione de resurrectione
de conuesatione cum decipulis suis
ac de gemino eius aduentu
Primo In humilitate dispectus quod *fo*
tu secundum potetate regali pre
clarum quod foturum est. quid ergo
mirum si Iohannes tam constanter
sincula etiā In epistulis suis proferat

[1] See Introduction for an account of the Manuscript.

dicens In semeipsu Quae uidimus oculis
nostris et auribus audiuimus et manus
nostrae palpauerunt haec scripsimus
& uobis
Sic enim non solum uisurem sed auditorem
sed et scriptorē omnium mirabiliū dn̄ī per ordi
nem profetetur Acta autē omniū apostolorum
sub uno libro scribta sunt Lucas obtime theofi
le comprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula
gerebantur sicut*e* et semote passionē Petri
&
euidenter declarat Sed profectionē pauli a*d* (b) ur
bes ad spaniā proficescentis Epistulae autem
Pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directe
sint uolen*ta*tibus intellegere Ipse declarantζ
Primū omnium corintheis scysmae heresis In
c
terdicens deInceps B callatis circumcisione
Romanis autē or*ni*dine scripturarum sed *et*
principium earum *osd* esse XP̄M Intimans
prolexius scripsit de quibus sincolis Neces
se est ad nobis desputari Cum ipse beatus
apostolus paulus sequens prodecessoris sui
n
Iohannis ordinē nonnisi comenati. semptaē
ii
eccles*e*s scribat ordine tali a corenthios
prima. ad efesios seconda ad philippinses ter
tia ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quin
ta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta. ad romanos
h
septima Uerum cor*e*(i)ntheis et tesaolecen
sibus licet pro correbtione Iteretur una
tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia
deffusa esse denoscitur Et Iohannis enī In a
pocalebsy licet septē eccleseis scribat
tamen omnibus dicit uerū ad filemonem una'
et at titū una et ad tymotheū duas pro affec
to et dilectione In honore tamen eclesiae ca
tholice In ordinatione eclesiastice
d*e*(i)scepline s̄cificate sunt Fertur etiam ad

Laudecenses alia ad alexandrinos Pauli no
re
mine fincte ad hesem marcionis et alia plu
ra quae In *ch*atholicam eclesiam recepi non
potest. Fel enim cum melle misceri non con
cruit epistola sane Iude et superscrictio
Iohannis duas In catholica habentur Et sapi
entia ab amicis salomonis in honorē ipsius
scripta apocalapse etiam Iohanis et Pe
tri tantum recip*e*(i)mus quam quidam ex nos
tris legi In eclesia nolunt Pastorem uero
nuperrim *et* temporibus nostris In urbe
roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe
r
tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio $\overline{\text{eps}}$ frate*r*
eius et ideo legi eum quidē Oportet se pu
plicare uero In eclesia populo Neque inter
profe tas conpletum numero Neque Inter
apostolos In finē temporum potest.
i
Arsinoi autem seu ualentini . uel mitiad*ei*s
nihil In totum recipemus. Qui etiam nouū
psalmorum librum marcioni conscripse
runt una cum basilide assianum catafry
a
cum contitutorem

(*Text as probably to be read.*)

. . . . . [1]quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit. Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucam. Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eum Paulus quasi [2]ut juris studiosum [3]secundum adsumsisset nomine suo ex [4]opinione conscripsit — Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne — et idem prout assequi potuit: ita et a nativitate Joannis incepit dicere. [5]Quarti

[1] This probably refers (as Eus. H. E. III. 39) to Mark's Gospel.

[2] *juris studiosum:* an obscure, probably corrupt reading. Hilgenfeld says the original was δευτεραγωνιστής.

[3] *Secundum.* Routh reads *secum.* Volkmar suggests that *secundum* is = *Nachfolger*, helper.

[4] *Ex opinione.* καθὼς ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ, Luke i. 3. Some read *ex ordine*, for καθεξῆς.

[5] *Quarti:* supply *auctor.*

Evangeliorum [6]Joannes ex discipulis. Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit: Conjejunate mihi hodie triduum, et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutrum nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte revelatum Andreae ex apostolis, ut recognoscentibus cunctis, Joannes suo nomine cuncta describeret. [7]Et ideo licet varia singulis Evangeliorum libris principia doceantur nihil tamen differt credentium fidei, cum uno ac principali spiritu declarata sint in omnibus omnia de nativitate, de passione, de resurrectione, de conversatione cum discipulis suis, et de gemino ejus adventu. [8]Primum in humilitate despectus, quod fuit secundum potestate regali praeclarum, quod futurum est. Quid ergo mirum, si Joannes tam constanter singula etiam in Epistolis suis proferat dicens in [9]semetipso: *Quae vidimus oculis nostris, et auribus audivimus, et manus nostrae palpaverunt, haec scripsimus vobis?* Sic enim non solum visorem, sed et auditorem, sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium Domini per ordinem profitetur. Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas [10]"optime Theophile" comprehendit, [11]quia sub praesentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et [12]semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed et profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis. Epistolae autem Pauli, quae, a quo loco, vel qua ex causa directae sint, volentibus intelligere ipsae declarant. Primum omnium Corinthiis schisma haeresis interdicens, deinceps [13]Galatis circumcisionem, Romanis autem ordine Scrip-

[6] *Joannes ex discipulis:* to distinguish him from the Baptist before named. Jerome gives a similar account.

[7] *Et ideo licet.* This seems to refer to some remarks prefixed to the whole, which are lost.

[8] *Primum — secundum.* So Westcott. Routh and Volkmar retain *Primo et secundo.* Wieseler reads *quod futurus est* in the following.

[9] *Semetipsum* (Westcott). Comp. 1 John i. 1. It may intimate a contrast between John's personal testimony in his Epistle, and the conjoined testimony which the Gospel is here said to be. Comp. John xxi. 24 but also xix. 35. The quotation in the text is from 1 John i. 1, 3, not verbally.

[10] *"optime Theophile"* = a quotation, Luke i. 3, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε. Others read *optimo Theophilo:* others *optime Theophilo.*

[11] *quia:* some read *quae* for *quia.*

[12] *semote* &c. Evidently corrupt. The martyrdom of Peter in Rome is apparently implied here. Credner keeps *declarat* as the verb after *semota* by a Graecism. Hilg. reads "*sicut et semota passione Petri evidenter declarat sed et profectione Pauli,*" &c. Westcott suggests *semota . . declarant:* Routh *remota . . declarant.*

[13] *Galatis.* The MS has "*DeInceps B. callactis.*" B marks Galatians as second in order of the Epistles. (Treg.)

turarum, sed et principium earum esse Christum intimans, prolixius scripsit; de quibus singulis [14]necesse est a nobis disputari; cum ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus sequens prodecessoris sui Joannis ordinem, nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali: Ad Corinthios prima, ad Ephesios secunda, ad Philippenses tertia, ad Colossenses quarta, ad Galatas quinta, ad Thessalonicenses sexta, ad Romanos septima. Verum Corinthiis, et Thessalonicensibus licet pro correptione iteretur, una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse denoscitur. Et Joannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit. Verum ad Philemonem unam, et ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum [15]duas pro affectu et dilectione; in honore tamen ecclesiae [16]catholicae, in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt. Fertur etiam ad [17]Laodicenses, alia ad [17]Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fictae ad haeresem [17]Marcionis, et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non [18]potest; fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit. Epistola sane Judae, et superscripti [19]Joannis [15]duas in catholica habentur; et [20]Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypses etiam Joannis, et Petri, tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Pastorem vero [21]nuperrime

[14] *necesse.* Probably alluding to the bearing of the three Epp. on the controversies of the writer's day.

[15] *duas.* In both instances of its occurrence *duas* is probably a singular noun = *a pair.*

[16] *Catholicae.* Tregelles points to Acts ix. 31 as the origin of this phrase.

[17] *Laodicenses* } See fragments of an Epistle (Latin) to the Laodicenses (not
Alexandrinos } however so old as this) in Westcott, Canon, App. E. The reference here is perhaps to Ephesians as in Marcion's Canon. It is conjectured that the Ep. to the Alexandrians here mentioned is the canonical "Hebrews," but this again rests on a conjecture that the Hebrews addressed in that Epistle were Alexandrians. *Ad haeresem* = πρὸς αἵρεσιν, *bearing upon the heresy:* or supply *refutandam.*

[18] *potest.* Apparently a Graecism as a rendering of ἔξεστιν: or δυνατόν ἐστιν.

[19] *Joannis.* It is doubtful whether all the three of John are here alluded to, the second being regarded as part of the first; or whether he regards himself as having quoted the first already.

[20] *et Sapientia.* Some read *ut:* but in that case the allusion or comparison is obscure. It is better to suppose that there is a gap in the original MS. "Wisdom" was a name given to "Proverbs" as well as to the apocryphal book "Wisdom of Solomon." (See Treg.)

[21] *nuperrime,* &c. Upon this passage the conclusions as to the date of the fragment are based. Origen supposes that the "Shepherd" may be written by the contemporary of Paul: but the statement in the text is explicit.

temporibus nostris in Urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente cathedra Urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio Episcopo fratre ejus; et ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in ecclesia populo, neque inter Prophetas, completum numero, neque inter Apostolos, in finem temporum potest. [22]Arsinoi autem, seu Valentini, vel Mitiadis nihil in totum recipimus. Qui etiam novum Psalmorum librum Marcioni conscripserunt una cum Basilide Assianum Catafrygum constitutorem ....

4. The Canon of Origen.

(*Euseb. H. E. VI.* 25.)

After giving Origen's Catalogue of the "22 Books in use among the Hebrews," Eusebius says that Origen proceeds:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, μόνα τέσσαρα εἰδέναι εὐαγγέλια μαρτύρεται, ὧδέ πως γράφων·

Ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν[1] *περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίῤῥητά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τόν ποτε τελώνην, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον· δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, ποιήσαντα, ὃν καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τούτων ὡμολόγησε φάσκων· Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου. καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιηκότα· ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην.*

Καὶ ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ δὲ τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην[2] *ἐξηγητικῶν, ὁ αὐτὸς ταῦτα περὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων φησίν·*

Ὁ δὲ ἱκανωθεὶς διάκονος γενέσθαι τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος, ἀλλὰ πνεύματος, Παῦλος· ὁ πεπληρωκὼς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ

[22] The conclusion is hopelessly unintelligible.

[1] ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν seem to be the words of Origen. The meaning ascribed by Euseb. to παράδοσις may be seen H. E. III. 25. See the following extract.

[2] From Origen in Joann. v. 3.

Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, οὐδὲ πάσαις ἔγραψεν αἷς ἐδίδαξεν ἐκκλησίαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἷς ἔγραψεν, ὀλίγους στίχους ἐπέστειλε. Πέτρος δὲ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία, ἧς πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν. Ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. Τί δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος λέγειν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου, ὃς εὐαγγέλιον ἓν καταλέλοιπεν, ὁμολογῶν δύνασθαι τοσαῦτα ποιεῖν ἃ οὐδὲ ὁ κόσμος χωρῆσαι ἐδύνατο; Ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν, κελευσθεὶς σιωπῆσαι καὶ μὴ γράψαι τὰς τῶν ἑπτὰ βροντῶν φωνάς. Καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων. Ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν.

Ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν Ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει·

Ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεως διαφορὰς, ὁμολογήσαι ἄν. Πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς, πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ.

Τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἴποιμ' ἄν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος[3] τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. Τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν. Ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπό τινων δὲ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς Πράξεις.

Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὧδε ἐχέτω.[4]

[3] After τινος the ordinary text has τὰ ἀποστολικὰ, καὶ ὥσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα κ.τ.λ.

[4] The testimony of Origen in those passages is to the following books of the N. T.: The four Gospels (with notes as to the apostolic sanction to Mark and Luke), the Pauline Epp. (not named in detail), the Apocalypse, 1 John, 1 Peter, and (as not accepted by all) 2 & 3 John, and 2 Peter. He refers also to

5. Canon of Eusebius.

(*Euseb. H. E. III.* 25.)

Περὶ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων θείων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων.

Εὔλογον δ' ἐνταῦθα γενομένους ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰς δηλωθείσας τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης γραφάς.[1] *Καὶ δὴ τακτέον ἐν πρώτοις τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύν, οἷς ἕπεται ἡ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν Ἀποστόλων γραφή. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτην τὰς Παύλου καταλεκτέον ἐπιστολὰς, αἷς ἑξῆς τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν, καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρου κυρωτέον ἐπιστολήν. Ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον, εἴγε φανείη, τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἧς τὰ δόξαντα κατὰ*

Acts. The Epp. of James and Jude are referred to elsewhere. (See under 'James' and 'Jude'.) His discussion of the authorship of "Hebrews" is noteworthy.

[1] The views of Eusebius on the Canon as a whole are in this passage. His opinions on the Gospels (H. E. III. 24) and on the Epistles (H. E. III. 3) are given elsewhere. Here he seems to make two catalogues; the first dividing Books into three classes: ὁμολογούμενα, ἀντιλεγόμενα, νόθα; the second (or explanatory list) adding a lower class, the deliberate forgeries published by heretics, and scarcely giving a place to νόθα. To the first class belong the 4 Gospels: the Acts: the Epp. of Paul: 1 John, 1 Peter: and (if it seem good) the Apocalypse. To the second belong James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John. In the third the only book of our Canon is the Apocal. "if it seem good" so to rank it. In H. E. III. 3 (quoted afterwards) he reckons 1 Peter: 14 of Paul (though the Roman Church counts Hebrews not Pauline). Of the chief non-canonical books we shall treat afterwards. The ὁμολ. or accepted books are called in the second list ἀληθεῖς, ἄπλαστοι, ἀνωμολογημέναι γραφαί: the ἀντιλεγ. are defined as οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγόμεναι, ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γιγνωσκόμεναι; the third class, νόθα, is apparently not repeated, unless it be obscurely glanced at when he says αὐτάς τε ταύτας, but instead of dwelling upon it he now adds the heretical books. By νόθα, however, he evidently means books that had no right to be in the Canon whether they be, or be not, the works of the men whose names they bear. The Acts of Paul and the Apocalypse of Peter he probably regarded as spurious; the Shepherd of Hermas may have been really the work of its reputed author; but all these are νόθα, uncanonical writings. See H. E. III. 3. By some (see Credn. Gesch. § 89 and Hilg. Einl. p. 116) this Catalogue is taken as containing two classes—the accepted and the disputed books—the latter being subdivided according to the various grades of acceptation (or of opposition) in the Church. By others (see Reuss Gesch. § 314) the classes are supposed to be three—ὁμολ., ἀντιλεγ. (νόθα) and πρὸς τῶν αἱρετ. προφερ. Eusebius probably did not rigidly define to himself the meaning of νόθα even in this passage: and elsewhere (H. E. II. 23) he says the Ep. of James νοθεύεται, and explains that both James and Jude have few primitive testimonies in their favour. In the same way he elsewhere calls Clem. Ep. I. to the Corr. ὁμολ., i.e., undoubtedly Clement's work; but ἀντιλ. as far as canonicity is concerned (H. E. III. 16, 38. VI. 13).

καιρὸν ἐκθησόμεθα. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις. Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἥ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.[2] Ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καὶ τῶν Παύλου πράξεων ἡ γραφὴ, ὅ τε λεγόμενος Ποιμὴν, καὶ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἡ φερομένη Βαρνάβα ἐπιστολή, καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί· ἔτι τε, ὡς ἔφην, ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανείη, ἥν τινες, ὡς ἔφην, ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις. Ἤδη δὲ ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον[3] κατέλεξαν, ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ἂν εἴη. Ἀναγκαίως δὲ καὶ τούτων ὅμως τὸν κατάλογον πεποιήμεθα, διακρίναντες τάς τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλάστους καὶ ἀνωμολογημένας γραφὰς, καὶ τὰς ἄλλως παρὰ ταύτας, οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγομένας, ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γιγνωσκομένας, ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοιμεν αὐτάς τε ταύτας, καὶ τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν ἀποστόλων πρὸς τῶν αἱρετικῶν προφερομένας, ἤτοι ὡς Πέτρου, καὶ Θωμᾶ, καὶ Ματθία, ἢ καὶ τινῶν παρὰ τούτους ἄλλων εὐαγγέλια περιεχούσας, ὡς Ἀνδρέου, καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων πράξεις, ὧν οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ τὰς διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν. Πόρρω δέ που καὶ ὁ τῆς φράσεως παρὰ τὸ ἦθος τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ἐναλλάττει χαρακτήρ· ἥ τε γνώμη καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαίρεσις, πλεῖστον ὅσον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀπᾴδουσα, ὅτι δὴ αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα τυγχάνει, σαφῶς παρίστησιν· ὅθεν οὐδ' ἐν νόθοις αὐτὰ κατατακτέον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παραιτητέον. Ἴωμεν δὴ λοιπὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑξῆς ἱστορίαν.

[2] See Euseb. H. E. III. 39; and Introduction to this work for notice of 'Presbyter John.'

[3] See 'Gospel of Hebrews,' *infra*.

6. Codex Vaticanus (Cod. B).

Probably the oldest MS of the N. T. and certainly dating from as early a time as the beginning of the fourth century. Its want of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian Canons seems to point to a date before Eusebius brought these into vogue;[1] and the form of its letters and peculiar readings tend to the same result. It is unfortunately defective from Heb. ix. 14. Its Books of the N. T. (it has the O. T. complete save parts of Genesis and Psalms) are Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, James, Peter (2), John (3), Jude, Romans, Corinthians (2), Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians (2), Hebrews ....

7. Codex Sinaiticus (Cod. ℵ),

discovered by Tischendorf in the convent of St Catharine on Mount Sinai, and published in 1862, contains (in addition to much of the O. T.) the New Testament as in our Canon in the following order: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Romans, Corinthians (2), Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians (2), Hebrews, Timothy (2), Titus, Philemon, Acts, James, Peter (2), John (3), Apocalypse.

Immediately after the Apocalypse, beginning on the same page with its conclusion, is the Epistle of Barnabas complete, followed by a considerable portion of the Shepherd of Hermas. The paging of the original sheets shows that some leaves of the MS which came between Barnabas and Hermas are lost. This MS dates from about the middle of the fourth century. It has been supposed that it may be one of the 50 copies prepared by Eusebius at the order of the Emperor Constantine, but there are objections to this view.

[1] See Tischendorf's reasoning against this conclusion, Cod. Vat. XXX. (1867).

8. Canon of Athanasius.[1]

(*Athan. Opp. Tom. II. p.* 38.)

Ἐκ τῆς λϑ' ἑορταστικῆς ἐπιστολῆς. A.D. 365.

Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ περὶ μὲν τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἐμνήσθημεν, ὡς νεκρῶν, περὶ δὲ ἡμῶν ὡς ἐχόντων πρὸς σωτηρίαν τὰς ϑείας γραφάς· καὶ φοβοῦμαι μήπως, ὡς ἔγραψεν Κορινθίοις Παῦλος, ὀλίγοι τῶν ἀκεραίων ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος πλανηθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς

[1] The Alexandrian Church was the most learned in the world, especially learned in Astronomy; and the Council of Nicaea imposed on its bishop as a duty to determine for Christendom (as it had been his custom to determine for his own diocese) the exact day for the celebration of each successive Easter. The result of the reckoning was not only published to all the towns and monasteries within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Alexandria, but was also made known to the Western Church through the Bishop of Rome, and to the Syrian Church through the Bishop of Antioch. By fixing the date of Easter, this yearly Epistle fixed the dates of all the Christian festivals of the year. From an early period the letters had been of growing repute as Episcopal Pastorals; but the Nicene decree made them officially binding. Athanasius was only a Deacon when that decree was made, but he heard it given forth, and for more than 40 years (329-373) amid all his occupations, even in his exile, he sent his "Festal Letter" to the Christian world. A part of one of those letters is given in the text; and it may be regarded as not only the opinion of Athanasius himself, but an official announcement of the common conclusions of Christendom on the subject of the Canon. He refers to the number of heretical books which were current. He points out that they were apt to deceive because they falsely claimed names kindred to those of the true books. The true books are fountains of salvation. He enumerates the books of the O. T. (Esther is omitted, and there are apocryphal additions to Jeremiah), and his N. T. list is exactly that of our Canon, "to which no one may add, and from which nothing may be taken away." But there are other books, of a lower grade, which neophytes may read with profit: the Wisdom of Solomon (often quoted by Athanasius elsewhere), Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Teaching of the Apostles, and Hermas. Far below them—and named only to be denounced—are the apocryphal books made by heretics, false in title and in date, constructed to deceive the unsuspicious. Many of the books reckoned in Athanasius's second class were ordinarily read in churches at the time—read for instruction, or quoted by preachers and writers—yet not as Canonical Scripture. No doubt, however, can be entertained that this practice led to confusion, which Athanasius in his letter sought to reduce to order. It was not a task without difficulty,—τόλμη he calls it. He himself elsewhere quotes Hermas and the Teaching of the Apostles, but never so as to contradict this solemn statement. We may add that this Epistle is admitted to be genuine, and that its testimony to the sacred books is to the same effect as all that we learn from the history of the Nicene Council and from contemporary quotations. (See Euseb. H. E. V. 25; VII. 20; Credner, Gesch. § 94.) Eusebius refers to Dionysius's letters (VII. 20. 22) and quotes largely from them, showing the high esteem in which they were held. The Festal letters seem to have been collected for reference and use from the very first; those of Dionysius, Athanasius, Theophilus, and Cyril being specially memorable. This by Athanasius does not exist in full, but the part on the Canon

πανουργίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ λοιπὸν ἐντυγχάνειν ἑτέροις ἄρξωνται τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀποκρύφοις, ἀπατώμενοι τῇ ὁμωνυμίᾳ τῶν ἀληθινῶν βιβλίων· παρακαλῶ ἀνέχεσθαι, εἰ περὶ ὧν ἐπίστασθε, περὶ τούτων κἀγὼ μνημονεύων γράφω, διά τε τὴν ἀνάγκην καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Μέλλων δὲ τούτων μνημονεύειν, χρήσομαι πρὸς σύστασιν τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ τόλμης τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Λουκᾶ, λέγων καὶ αὐτὸς· ἐπειδήπερ τινὲς ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι ἑαυτοῖς τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα, καὶ ἐπιμίξαι ταῦτα τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ, περὶ ἧς ἐπληφορήθημεν, καθὼς παρέδοσαν τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου· ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ προτραπέντι παρὰ γνησίων ἀδελφῶν, καὶ μαθόντι ἄνωθεν, ἑξῆς ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα, πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία· ἵνα ἕκαστος, εἰ μὲν ἠπατήθη, καταγνῷ τῶν πλανησάντων· ὁ δὲ καθαρὸς διαμείνας, χαίρῃ πάλιν ὑπομιμνησκόμενος.

Ἔστι τοίνυν τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὰ πάντα εἰκοσιδύο· τοσαῦτα γὰρ, ὡς ἤκουσα, καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα τὰ παρ᾽ Ἑβραίοις εἶναι παραδέδοται. Τῇ δὲ τάξει καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί ἐστιν ἕκαστον οὕτως· πρῶτον Γένεσις, εἶτα Ἔξοδος, εἶτα Λευιτικὸν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Ἀριθμοὶ, καὶ λοιπὸν τὸ Δευτερονόμιον. Ἑξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, καὶ Κριταί. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ Ροῦθ. Καὶ πάλιν ἑξῆς Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα βιβλία· καὶ τούτων τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμεῖται· τὸ δὲ τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον ὁμοίως εἰς ἕν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Παραλειπομένων $\bar{\alpha}$ καὶ $\bar{\beta}$, ὁμοίως εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμούμενα· εἶτα Ἔσδρας $\bar{\alpha}$ καὶ $\bar{\beta}$ ὁμοίως εἰς ἕν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα βίβλος Ψαλμῶν, καὶ ἑξῆς Παροιμίαι· εἶτα Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, καὶ Ἆσμα ᾀσμάτων. Πρὸς τούτοις ἔστι καὶ Ἰὼβ, καὶ λοιπὸν Προφῆται· οἱ μὲν δώδεκα εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμούμενοι. Εἶτα Ἡσαΐας, Ἱερεμίας, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαροὺχ, Θρῆνοι, Ἐπιστολὴ, καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν Ἰεζεκιὴλ καὶ Δανιήλ. Ἄχρι τούτων τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης ἵσταται.

is frequently quoted. Of the greater part of it a Syriac translation was found along with other Festal letters in the Nitrian MSS in the British Museum. There is a German Translation of the Festal Letters by Larsow (1852), a Latin one by Mai (1854), and an English one (1854) "Library of Fathers" Athanasius appears to have written 45 letters; and most of those which have come down to us contain not only instructions as to their proper subject, but also (prefixed to the paragraph containing the computation) exhortations to steadfastness in Christian doctrine and practice. The text is after Migne's Edition (1857), vol. ii. p. 1436. See there the prefatory account, p. 1339 (after Mai).

Τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς πάλιν οὐκ ὀκνητέον εἰπεῖν· ἔστι γὰρ ταῦτα. Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα· κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην. Εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ Καθολικαὶ καλούμενα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἑπτά· οὕτως μὲν Ἰακώβου α', Πέτρου δὲ β', εἶτα Ἰωάννου γ', καὶ μετὰ ταύτας Ἰούδα α'. Πρὸς τούτοις Παύλου ἀποστόλου εἰσὶν ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, τῇ τάξει γραφόμεναι οὕτως· πρώτη πρὸς Ῥωμαίους· εἶτα πρὸς Κορινθίους δύο· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Γαλάτας· καὶ ἑξῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους· εἶτα πρὸς Φιλιππησίους καὶ πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς· καὶ μετὰ ταύτας πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δύο· καὶ ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους· καὶ εὐθὺς πρὸς μὲν Τιμόθεον δύο· πρὸς δὲ Τίτον μία· καὶ τελευταία ἡ πρὸς Φιλήμονα. Καὶ πάλιν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις.

Ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα τῶν ἐν τούτοις ἐμφορεῖσθαι λογίων· ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται. Μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω· μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω τι. Περὶ δὲ τούτων ὁ Κύριος Σαδδουκαίους μὲν ἐδυσώπει, λέγων· "Πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς." τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις παρήνει· "Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς· ὅτι αὐταί εἰσι αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ." Ἀλλ' ἕνεκά γε πλείονος ἀκριβείας προστίθημι δὴ τοῦτο γράφων ἀναγκαίως· ὡς ὅτι ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον· Σοφία Σολομῶντος, καὶ Σοφία Σιρὰχ, καὶ Ἑσθὴρ, καὶ Ἰουδίθ, καὶ Τωβίας, καὶ Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ὁ Ποιμήν. Καὶ ὅμως ἀγαπητοί, κἀκείνων κανονιζομένων, καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων, οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἀποκρύφων μνήμη· ἀλλὰ αἱρετικῶν ἐστιν ἐπίνοια, γραφόντων μὲν ὅτε θέλουσιν αὐτὰ, χαριζομένων δὲ καὶ προστιθέντων αὐτοῖς χρόνους, ἵν' ὡς παλαιὰ προφέροντες, πρόφασιν ἔχωσιν ἀπατᾶν ἐκ τούτου τοὺς ἀκεραίους.

9. Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius.[1]

Πᾶσα γραφὴ ἡμῶν Χριστιανῶν, θεόπνευστός ἐστιν. Οὐκ ἀόριστα δὲ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὡρισμένα καὶ κεκανονισμένα ἔχει τὰ βιβλία.

[1] This Synopsis is not regarded as genuine. It is not mentioned by any ancient author as the work of Athanasius. Jerome is silent upon it. It does not agree in its list of books either of the Old Testament or of the New with those

Καὶ ἔστι τῆς μὲν Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης ταῦτα· . . . . [Here follow the Books of the O. T. including the Apocrypha (which however are distinguished as *μὴ κανονιζόμενα*), and making two of Esdras.] *Τὰ δὲ τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης, πάλιν ὡρισμένα τε καὶ κεκανονισμένα βιβλία, ταῦτα·* (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Seven Catholic Epp., Paul's Epp. 14 in number [Hebrews being named before the Pastoral Epp.], Apocalypse.) *Τοσαῦτα καὶ τὰ τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης βιβλία τά γε κανονιζόμενα, καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν οἱονεὶ ἀκροθίνια ἢ ἄγκυραι καὶ ἐρείσματα· ὡς παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῶν καὶ συγγενομένων ἐκείνῳ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μαθητευθέντων, γραφέντα καὶ ἐκτεθέντα. Ἐπεὶ τοί γε ὕστερον κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνων ἀκολουθίαν καὶ συμφωνίαν ἄλλα μυρία καὶ ἀναρίθμητα βιβλία ἐξεπονήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ καιροὺς μεγάλων καὶ σοφωτάτων Θεοφόρων Πατέρων εἰς μαρτυρίαν τῶν προλαβόντων καὶ διαφώτισιν· περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν λόγος, ὡς παμπόλλων καὶ ἀορίστων, καὶ ἅμα πάντων τῆς αὐτῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῖς παλαιοῖς τούτοις ἐχομένων, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐξηγουμένων καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ διασαφούντων.* (Then follow detailed notices of the several books of Scripture, after which the author speaks of the Apocrypha and says), *Τῆς Νέας πάλιν Διαθήκης ἀντιλεγόμενα ταῦτα· Περίοδοι Πέτρου, Περίοδοι Ἰωάννου, Περίοδοι Θωμᾶ, Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Θωμᾶ, Διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων, Κλημέντια, ἐξ ὧν μετεφράσθησαν ἐκλεγέντα τὰ ἀληθέστερα καὶ θεόπνευστα. Ταῦτα τὰ ἀναγινωσκόμενα.*

Ταῦτα πάντα ἐξετέθησαν μὲν ὅσον πρὸς εἴδησιν, παραγεγραμμένα δὲ εἰσὶ πάντως καὶ νόθα, καὶ ἀπόβλητα. Καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων, τῶν ἀποκρύφων μάλιστα, ἔγκριτον ἢ ἐπωφελὲς, ἐξαιρέτως τῆς Νέας Διαθήκης· ἀλλὰ πάντα δίχα τῶν ἀνωτέρω διαληφθέντων, καὶ ἐγκριθέντων παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ πατράσιν, ἀποκρυφῆς μᾶλλον ἢ ἀναγνώσεως ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄξια· τά τε ἄλλα, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ καλούμενα ἐν αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλια, ἐκτὸς τῶν παραδοθέντων ἡμῖν τεσσάρων τούτων. Εὐαγγέλια γὰρ τέσσαρα ἐθέσπισαν ἡμῖν

given in the previous extract from the Paschal letter. Among other points of difference we may notice that the Synopsis does not mention Hermas, and does mention the Clementines—in both respects being the opposite of the Festal Letter. It has been attempted to find an allusion to this in a passage in Athanasius, "Apologia ad Constantium Imp.," p. 236, when he speaks of sending πυκτία τῶν Ξείων γραφῶν. But πυκτία cannot mean a Synopsis. (See Migne, Proleg. p. CLXXVI.) The Synopsis is supposed to be as late as the 9th century. The text is abridged from Migne, vol. iv. p. 283, &c.

οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας· τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, καὶ τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην, κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν τῆς ὀπτασίας, ἧς ἐθεάσατο Ἰεζεκιὴλ ὁ προφήτης περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων Χερουβίμ. Τέσσαρα γὰρ εἶδε Χερουβὶμ οὗτος ὁ προφήτης· τὸ ἓν ὅμοιον ἀνθρώπῳ, τουτέστι τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον· τὸ δεύτερον ὅμοιον μόσχῳ, τουτέστι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγέλιον· τὸ ἄλλο ὅμοιον λέοντι, τουτέστι τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὅμοιον ἀετῷ, τουτέστι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον. Παρὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὰ τέσσαρα ἕτερον Εὐαγγέλιον οὐδέν.

Τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον ἐγράφη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ματθαίου τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, καὶ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἡρμηνεύθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὃς καὶ πρῶτος ἐχειροτονήθη ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.

Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη μὲν ὑπὸ Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐξεδόθη δὲ ὑπὸ Μάρκου τοῦ μακαρίου ἀποστόλου, καὶ ἐκηρύχθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἐν Πενταπόλει, καὶ Λιβύῃ.

Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη μὲν ὑπὸ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, συνεγράφη δὲ καὶ ἐξεδόθη ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ τοῦ μακαρίου ἀποστόλου καὶ ἰατροῦ· ὥσπερ καὶ Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὑπηγόρευσε μὲν ὁμοίως Πέτρος ὁ ἀπόστολος, συνεγράψατο δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Λουκᾶς.

Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη τε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἠγαπημένου, ὄντος ἐξορίστου ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, διὰ Γαΐου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ ξενοδόχου τῶν ἀποστόλων, περὶ οὗ καὶ Παῦλος Ῥωμαίοις γράφων φησί· Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γαΐος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

II.
TESTIMONIES TO THE CANON.

1. Canon of the Laodicene Council A.D. 364.[1]

Canons LIX, LX.

Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. — Ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης· α′ Γένεσις κόσμου, β′ Ἔξοδος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, γ′ Λευιτικὸν, δ′ Ἀριθμοὶ, ε′ Δευτερονόμιον, ς′ Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ, ζ′ Κριταὶ, Ρουθ, η′ Ἐσθὴρ, θ′ Βασιλειῶν πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα, ι′ Βασιλειῶν τρίτη καὶ τετάρτη, ια′ Παραλειπόμενα πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιβ′ Ἔσδρας πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιγ′ βίβλος Ψαλμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα, ιδ′ Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος, ιε′ Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, ις′ Ἆσμα ᾀσμάτων, ιζ′ Ἰωβ, ιη′ δώδεκα Προφῆται, ιθ′ Ἡσαΐας, κ′ Ἱερεμίας καὶ Βαρουχ, Θρηνοὶ καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ, κα′ Ἰεζεκιὴλ, κβ′ Δανιήλ. — Τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ταῦτα· Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, Ἐπιστολαὶ Καθολικαὶ ἑπτὰ οὕτως· Ἰακώβου α′, Πέτρου α′β′, Ἰωάννου β′γ′, Ἰούδα α′· Ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου δεκατέσσαρες· πρὸς Ῥωμαίους α′, πρὸς Κορινθίους α′β′, πρὸς Γαλάτας α′, πρὸς Ἐφεσίους α′, πρὸς Φιλιππησίους α′, πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς α′, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς α′β′, πρὸς Ἑβραίους α′, πρὸς Τιμόθεον α′β′, πρὸς Τίτον α′, πρὸς Φιλήμονα α′.[2]

[1] The Synod of Laodicea about A.D. 360 was only a local, probably an Arian, Synod, attended by 20 or 30 bishops from Lydia and Phrygia. The 59th Canon (ὅτι οὐ δεῖ . . . . διαθήκης) is genuine; but the Catalogue which follows is now generally admitted to be the work of a later age. It will be observed that the Apocalypse is omitted. The decree was confirmed by the Quinisextine (Trullan) Council of Constantinople A.D. 692, and again by the Council of Jerusalem A.D. 1672, which, after the commotion caused by Cyril Lukar, endeavoured to settle the Canon. The Trullan Council based the acceptance of Scripture on the decrees of the Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, and on the writings of certain fathers. There was no special legate of Rome at the Council, although the ordinary representatives of the Bishop of Rome were present; and the Roman Church does not recognize all its decrees as binding. The same Council which accepted the decrees of Carthage and Laodicea, accepted also the "Apostolical Canons".

[2] From Westcott's text. See his interesting history of the text: Canon of N. T., 3rd ed., p. 400. See also Hilg. Einl., p. 119. Credner, Gesch. d. N. T. Kanon, 245. Bruns, Can. Apost. et Concil. Saec., IV-VII. p. 77.

2. Canon of Cyril of Jerusalem.[1]

Catechis. IV, p. 36 ff.

Περὶ τῶν θειῶν γραφῶν.

Ταῦτα δὲ διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τε καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. Εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τῶν δύο διαθηκῶν Θεὸς, ὁ τὸν ἐν τῇ καινῇ φανέντα Χριστὸν ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ προκαταγγείλας, ὁ διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν εἰς Χριστὸν παιδαγωγήσας. Πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα, καὶ ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν. Κἂν ποτε τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀκούσῃς τινὸς βλασφημοῦντος νόμον ἢ προφήτας, ἀντιφθέγξαι τὴν σωτηρίαν φωνὴν λέγων· Οὐκ ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. Καὶ φιλομαθῶς ἐπίγνωθι παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ποῖαι μέν εἰσιν αἱ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βίβλοι, ποῖαι δὲ τῆς καινῆς· καί μοι μηδὲν τῶν ἀποκρύφων ἀναγίνωσκε. Ὁ γὰρ τὰ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογούμενα μὴ εἰδὼς, τί περὶ τὰ ἀμφιβαλλόμενα ταλαιπωρεῖς μάτην; Ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφὰς, τὰς εἴκοσι δύο βίβλους τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο ἑρμηνευτῶν ἑρμηνευθείσας. . . . . Τῆς δὲ καινῆς διαθήκης, τὰ τέσσαρα Εὐαγγέλια· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ψευδεπίγραφα καὶ βλαβερὰ τυγχάνει. Ἔγραψαν καὶ Μανιχαῖοι κατὰ Θωμᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον, ὅπερ, ὥσπερ εὐωδίᾳ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς προσωνυμίας, διαφθείρει τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἁπλουστέρων. Δέχου δὲ καὶ τὰς Πράξεις τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων· πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰούδα Καθολικὰς Ἐπιστολάς· ἐπισφράγισμα δὲ τῶν πάντων καὶ μαθητῶν τὸ τελευταῖον, τὰς Παύλου δεκατέσσαρας ἐπιστολάς. Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ. Καὶ ὅσα μὲν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε, καθὼς ἤκουσας. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων, ταῦτα.[2]

[1] Cyril died A.D. 386. It will be observed that he includes without hesitation in his N. T. all the books save the Apocalypse. Those which Eusebius a few years before had described as Antilegomena seem in the interval to have been accepted by all. Cyril founds his statements on the general agreement to which the Church had come; and appeals from local or individual peculiarities to that general consent. There is in the closing words a reference to some books that may be read in some Churches but are only fitted for the "second rank;" and others not read in Churches at all are to be avoided by the private reader.

[2] The Apocalypse must be in this second rank. Even in treating of Antichrist elsewhere Cyril does not quote the Apocalypse.

3. Canon of the Third Council of Carthage A.D. 397.[1]

Canon XLVII.

[2] Item placuit, ut praeter scripturas canonicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum scripturarum. Sunt autem canonicae scripturae: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Jesus Nave, Judicum, Ruth, Regnorum libri quatuor, Paralipomenon libri duo, Job, Psalterium Davidicum, Salomonis libri quinque, libri duodecim Prophetarum, Jesaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Esdrae libri duo, Machabaeorum libri duo. Novi autem Testamenti Evangeliorum libri quatuor, Actuum Apostolorum liber unus, Epistolae Pauli apostoli tredecim, ejusdem ad Hebraeos una, Petri apostoli duae, Joannis ap. tres, Judae ap. una, Apocalypsis Joannis liber unus. Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifacio [3] vel aliis earum

[1] From Bruns, p. 133.

[2] Between A.D. 390 and A.D. 419 six Councils were held in Africa, four of them in Carthage (Bruns 111-151). This—the third of those—was held under the presidency of Aurelius, Bp. of Carthage. Augustine (as Bishop of Hippo) was present. So far as we know, it was the first Council of the Christian Church which enumerated the Books of N. T. Scripture; for although the Laodicene Decree (given above) is earlier, the genuine portion does not contain the Catalogue. It was not a general Council; it was only a local Council, attended by 44 Bishops, all of whom subscribed the decree. It is not therefore an authoritative utterance of the general Church. Its decree was not confirmed by any larger Council till A.D. 692, when the Trullan Council (see note on Laodicene Decree) accepted it for the Eastern Church. In the Western Church more than 1000 years passed before the unfinished task of defining the Canon was resumed; and even then (A.D. 1435) it was the solitary voice of a Pope (Eugenius) which proclaimed its completion. Nearly 1200 years passed before a general Council (Trent) made a decree on the subject, and its conclusions were much less accurate than those of the little gathering in Carthage. The acceptance of a Canon of the N. T. does not rest on the authority of the corporate Church. And it is not as to an Ecclesiastical authority that we look back to the Council of Carthage; but we find in its decree a statement of a well-ascertained fact—the general agreement of the Church as to the nature and number of the Books of Canonical Scripture. The decree bears on the face of it that the question was as to what should be read in Churches; and that the answer was: Canonical Scripture alone, save that on Days of the Saints the histories of their Martyrdoms might be read in addition to the Canon. To prevent ambiguity, the names of the Books denoted "Canonical Scripture" are added.

[3] This reference to Boniface is supposed by some to have been originally a marginal note which in course of time found its way into the text. Boniface was not Bishop of Rome at the time of the Council. It is supposed that when the African Canons were collected into one Code, this passage was a reference to him and other representatives of foreign Churches, not intended to be taken as part of the original decree. There are various readings, *Consacerdoti*, *Coepiscopo*, &c., in his name, intimating that liberties were taken with the designation of Boniface.

partium episcopis pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus in ecclesia legenda. Liceat enim legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur.

4. Canon of Epiphanius.[1]

Haeres. Tom. I. p. 941.

Εἰ γὰρ ἦς ἐξ ἁγίου πνεύματος γεγεννημένος, καὶ προφήταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις μεμαθητευμένος, ἔδει σε διελθόντα ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς γενέσεως κόσμου ἄχρι τῶν τῆς Αἰσθὴρ χρόνων, ἐν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑπτὰ βίβλοις παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, εἴκοσι δύο ἀριθμουμένοις, τέτταρσι δὲ ἁγίοις Εὐαγγελίοις, καὶ ἐν τεσσαρσικαίδεκα Ἐπιστολαῖς τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πρὸ τούτων καὶ σὺν ταῖς ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν χρόνοις Πράξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Καθολικαῖς Ἐπιστολαῖς Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰούδα, καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψει, ἐν δὲ ταῖς Σοφίαις Σολομῶντος τέ φημι, καὶ υἱοῦ Σιρὰχ, καὶ πάσαις ἁπλῶς γραφαῖς θείαις, καὶ ἑαυτοῦ καταγνῶναι ὅτι ὄνομα ὅπερ οὐδαμοῦ ἐντέτακται ἦλθες ἡμῖν φέρων, οὐκ ἀπρεπὲς μὲν Θεῷ, ἀλλ᾽ εὐσεβὲς εἰς Θεὸν τὸ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου ὄνομα, μηδαμοῦ δὲ ἐν θειᾷ γραφῇ ῥηθέν.

5. Canon of Jerome.

Epist. II. ad Paulinum (Opp. T. IV. p. 574).

Tangam et Novum breviter Testamentum. Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Joannes, quadriga Domini et verum Cherubim, quod interpretatur *scientiae multitudo,* per totum corpus oculati sunt, scintillae emicant, discurrunt fulgura, pedes habent rectos et in sublime tendentes, terga pennata et ubique volitantia. Tenent mutuo, et quasi rota in rota volvuntur, et pergunt quocunque eos flatus Sancti Spiritus perduxerit.

But—assuming that the decree was in answer to a question—it may have been some neighbouring local bishop who put the question, and whose name was Boniface.

[1] Epiphanius, born in Palestine, died bishop of Constantia in Cyprus A.D 403. His great work, *Panarium* or Refutation of all Heresies, shows much learning, but is always diffuse, and often not trustworthy where his theories come in the way of his historical vision. It has not borne the test of criticism and comparison with other authorities nearly so well as Eusebius's Eccl. Hist.

Paulus Apostolus ad septem ecclesias scribit (octava enim ad Hebraeos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur), Timotheum instruit ac Titum, Philemonem pro fugitivo famulo deprecatur. Super quo tacere melius puto, quam pauca scribere. Actus Apostolorum nudam quidem sonare videntur historiam, et nascentis ecclesiae infantiam texere: sed si noverimus scriptorem eorum Lucam esse medicum, *cujus laus est in evangelio,* animadvertemus pariter omnia verba illius, animae languentis esse medicinam. Jacobus, Petrus, Joannes, Judas apostoli septem epistolas ediderunt tam mysticas quam succinctas et breves pariter et longas: breves in verbis, longas in sententiis, ut rarus sit qui non in earum lectione caecutiat. Apocalypsis Joannis tot habet sacramenta, quot verba. Parum dixi pro merito voluminis. Laus omnis inferior est: in verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiae.

6. Augustine.[1]

Erit igitur divinarum scripturarum solertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit notasque habuerit, et si nondum intellectu jam tamen lectione, duntaxat eas quae appellantur Canonicae. Nam caeteras securius leget fide veritatis instructus, ne praecoccupent imbecillum animum, et periculosis mendaciis atque phantasmatis eludentes praejudicent aliquid contra sanam intelligentiam. In Canonicis autem Scripturis, ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur; inter quas sane illae sint, quae apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Scripturis Canonicis, ut eas quae ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis Catholicis praeponat eis quas quaedam non accipiunt: in eis vero quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas quas plures gravioresque accipiunt eis quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiae tenent. Si autem alias invenerit a pluribus, alias a gravioribus haberi, quanquam hoc facile invenire non possit, aequalis tamen auctoritatis eas

[1] Aug., *De Doctrina Christiana*, II. 12. 13. Augustine was Bishop of Hippo, born A.D. 354, died A.D. 430. His opinion on Canonicity is not so valuable as his contemporary Jerome's. But in his voluminous writings he shows not only his own opinion but the views current in his time. He accepted the received Canon of the New Testament. He had doubts as to the authorship of Hebrews, but none as to its Canonicity.

habendas puto. Totus autem Canon Scripturarum in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus, his libris continetur.

[Here follow the Books of the O. T.]

Novi autem, quatuor libris Evangelii, secundum Matthaeum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Joannem; quatuordecim Epistolis Pauli Apostoli, ad Romanos, ad Corinthios duabus, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Thessalonicenses duabus, ad Colossenses, ad Timotheum duabus, ad Titum, ad Philemonem, ad Hebraeos; Petri duabus; tribus Joannis; una Judae et una Jacobi; Actibus Apostolorum libro uno, et Apocalypsi Joannis libro uno.

In his omnibus libris timentes Deum et pietate mansueti quaerunt voluntatem Dei.

7. Chrysostom.

Chrysostom (died A.D. 407), who had been a Presbyter in Antioch before he was made Patriarch of Constantinople, never cites the Apocalypse or the four Catholic Epistles which are excluded from the Syriac Canon. In a Synopsis ascribed to him the Apocalypse is wanting, and the Catholic Epistles are expressly mentioned as three in number.

8. Cod. Alex.

Codex Alexandrinus (Cod. A). Date perhaps end of fourth century, probably beginning of fifth. It contains all the N. T. in the following list: Matt., Mark, Luke, John, Acts, *Cath. Epp.* (James, Peter (2), John (3), Jude), *Epp. of Paul* (Rom., Cor. (2), Gal., Eph., Phil., Coloss., Thess. (2), Hebrews, Timothy (2), Titus, Philemon), Apocalypse of John, Clement's Epp. (2), after which come the words *δμοῦ βιβλία*, as though to intimate that the Canon is closed, but another line adds Psalms of Solomon (18).

9. Gelasius, a.d. 492.[1]

The Decree as connected with the name of *Gelasius* runs thus as regards the N. T:—

Item ordo Scripturarum Novi Testamenti, quem Sancta Ca-

[1] The "Decree of Gelasius" *(Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis)*

tholica Romana suscipit et veneratur ecclesia. Evangeliorum libri IV, id est sec. Matthaeum lib. I, sec. Marcum lib. I, sec. Lucam lib. I, sec. Joannem lib. I. Item Actuum Apostolorum lib. I.

Epistolae Pauli Apostoli num. XIIII.

Apocalypsis lib. I. Apostolicae epistolae num. VII. Petri apostoli num. II. Jacobi apostoli num. I. Joannis apostoli num. III: Judae.

The Recension in the name of a Council under *Damasus* gives the names of the Pauline Epistles, and ascribes one Epistle to John the Apostle, two to John the Presbyter, and the Apocalypse to John the Apostle.

The Recension in the name of *Hormisdas* gives the three Johannine Epistles without distinction.

There is also a famous chapter containing the names of many books which the Catholic Apostolic Roman Church does not at all admit, because they are heretical or schismatical.[2] Among them are:

Acts: Itinerarium Petri Apostoli, quod appellatur Sancti Clementis, Actus Andreae, Thomae libr. x, Petri, Philippi.

Gospels: Evv. nomine Petri Apostoli, Matthiae, Jacobi Minoris, Barnabae, Thomae (quibus Manichaei utuntur) Bartholomaei, Andreae, Thaddaei, "Evv. quae falsavit Lucianus, apocrypha; Evv. quae falsavit Isicius, apocrypha."

Miscellaneous: De infantia Salvatoris et de Maria obstetrice ejus; liber qui appellatur Pastoris, apocr.; libri omnes,

is valuable as containing an official statement on the part of the Roman Church regarding the Books to be read and to be avoided respectively. Its origin and date are uncertain, and it comes to us with many variations in different MSS. It may date (or perhaps some germ of it dates,) from Damasus (366-384); some of it is as old as Gelasius, (492-496); but its principal forms claim the name of Hormisdas (514-523), although probably altered in later times. It appears to rest on the earlier testimonies of Athanasius and Jerome. The list of Biblical Books is not found in all the MSS, but seems to have been added by (or ascribed at a later date to) Hormisdas, and sent to Spain, where it was much needed. It shows that views regarding the Canon required to be corrected in many places at the beginning of the sixth Century. In the O. T. it includes the Apocrypha.

[2] See Volkmar's Credner's Gesch. des N. T. Kanon, p. 290, and Credner Zur Geschichte, p. 213. See Credner's summary in the last-named book, p. 289.

quos fecit Leucius (al. Lucius, Leutius) discipulus diaboli; liber qui appellatur Fundamentum; liber qui appellatur Thesaurus; liber de filiabus Adae; Leptogenesis; liber, qui appellatur Actus Theclae et Pauli; liber qui appellatur Nepotis (al. Nephotes); liber proverbiorum Sancti Xysti, ab haereticis conscriptus, apocrypha.

Apocalypses: Pauli, Thomae, Stephani.

10. Apostolical Constitutions (διατάξεις).[1]

II. 57. *Μέσος δ' ὁ ἀναγνώστης ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος ἑστὼς ἀναγινωσκέτω τὰ Μωσέως. Καὶ . . . . μετὰ τοῦτο αἱ Πράξεις αἱ ἡμέτεραι ἀναγινωσκέσθωσαν καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου τοῦ συνεργοῦ ἡμῶν, ἃς ἐπέστειλε ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καθ' ὑφήγησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα*

[1] The Apostolical Constitutions should perhaps scarcely be quoted, as being an obvious forgery. Reuss refers the greater part of them to the third century, but they more probably belong, in whole or in part, to the following century. They claim to be sent by Clement, together with Barnabas, Timothy, and Mark. They begin in name of the Apostles and Elders. Elsewhere they claim to be written by the "twelve Apostles who are not now together." If this claim to be a formal ordinance of the Apostles were only admitted, the question of the Canon would be settled! But the first barely probable allusions to the work are in the writings of Eusebius and of Athanasius, who speak of a book called the doctrine (or doctrines) of the Apostles. Athanasius speaks of it (διδαχή) as a book useful for instructing catechumens. Eusebius puts it (διδαχαί) among the spurious. Epiphanius speaks of a sect—the Audians—who found on the διάταξις τῶν ἀποστόλων, a book counted doubtful (he says) by most people, but still not unworthy of regard, inasmuch as it contains the whole order of Church Government. Even, however, if we regarded the book which Epiphanius had in view as being that to which Athanasius and Eusebius refer we have not found any proof of its existence earlier than the fourth century, or the end of the third. But, moreover, the extracts which Epiphanius gives do not agree with the contents of the book which has come down to us. Furthermore, Epiphanius regards it as doubtful, and does not mention it in his own list of Canonical Books. The Book, as we have it, witnesses against itself. We observe also that it contradicts the New Testament in prescribing feast-days and fast-days, and that it is inconsistent with the New Testament in making all the twelve Apostles survive till the time when John wrote. It nevertheless contains, amid many churchly directions of late date, not a few beautiful homiletic passages, and indicates great reverence for Scripture. It urges reading of the Gospels as the complement (συμπλήρωμα) of the Law, the Kings, and the Prophets (I. 5); enjoins Exposition of the Gospel along with the Prophets and the Law (II. 5); and in an elaborate passage, giving instructions as to public worship, it directs that "our Acts" and Paul's Epistles, and the Gospels of Matthew and John, and of "Paul's fellow-labourers" Mark and Luke, be read, and the Hymns of David be sung (II. 57).—Bunsen Analecta Antenicaena.

διάκονος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἀναγινωσκέτω τὰ εὐαγγέλια, ἃ ἐγὼ Ματθαῖος καὶ Ἰωάννης παρεδώκαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἃ οἱ συνεργοὶ Παύλου παρειληφότες κατέλειψαν ὑμῖν, Λουκᾶς καὶ Μάρκος.

At a later stage the same work says:—

VI. 16. *Ταῦτα πάντα ἐπεστείλαμεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδέναι ἔχοιτε τὴν ἡμετέραν (τῶν ἀποστόλων) γνώμην, οἵα τις ἐστί· καὶ τὰ ἐπ᾽ ὀνόματι ἡμῶν παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν κρατυθεντα βιβλία μὴ παραδέχεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ τοῖς ὀνόμασι χρὴ ὑμᾶς προσέχειν τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τῇ ἀδιαστρόφῳ. Οἴδαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι οἱ περὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Κλέοβιον, ἰώδη συντάξαντες βιβλία ἐπ᾽ ὀνόμασι Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, περιφέρουσιν εἰς ἀπάτην ὑμῶν τῶν πεφιλημένων Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς αὐτοῦ δούλους. Καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς δέ τινες συνέγραψαν βιβλία ἀπόκρυφα Μωσέως, καὶ Ἐνὼχ, καὶ Ἀδὰμ, Ἡσαΐου τε καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἠλία καὶ τῶν τριῶν Πατριαρχῶν, φθοροποιὰ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά. Τοιαῦτα καὶ νῦν ἐποίησαν οἱ δυσώνυμοι διαβάλλοντες δημιουργίαν, γάμον, προνοίαν, τεκνογονίαν, νόμον, προφήτας· βαρβαρά τινα ὀνόματα ἐγγράφοντες καὶ, ὡς αὐτοί φασιν, ἀγγέλων, τὸ δ᾽ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν δαιμόνων τῶν αὐτοῖς ὑπηχούντων· ὧν ἀποφεύγετε τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἵνα μὴ μετάσχητε τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν αὐτὰ συγγραψαμένων ἐπ᾽ ἀπάτῃ καὶ ἀπωλείᾳ τῶν πιστῶν καὶ ἀμέμπτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μαθητῶν.*

11. Canones Ecclesiastici qui dicuntur Apostolorum, c. 85.[1]

Ἔστω δὲ ὑμῖν πᾶσι κληρικοῖς καὶ λαϊκοῖς βιβλία σεβάσμια καὶ ἅγια· τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, Μωϋσέως πέντε, Γένεσις,

[1] From Bunsen's Analecta Antenicæna (1854). This Canon probably dates from the fourth century. To this date we are led by the omission of the Apocalypse, which was not acceptable to the Eastern Christians at that time. The curious claim that the Constitutions were "inscribed to you the Bishops by me Clement, in eight books, which ought not to be divulged before all," connects the Canons with the Constitutions, regarding which see last Note. The title as given above, "*Canones Ecclesiastici qui dicuntur Apostolorum*," is that given to the Collection by Dionysius the Less, a priest who translated them from the Greek, A.D. 500. It indicates the translator's doubts of their genuineness; and he even

Ἔξοδος, Λευϊτικὸν, Ἀριθμοὶ, καὶ Δευτερονόμιον, Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυὴ, ἕν· τῶν Κριτῶν, ἕν· τῆς Ῥοὺθ, ἕν· Βασιλειῶν τέσσαρα· Παραλειπομένων τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν ἡμερῶν, δύο· Ἔσδρα, δύο· Ἐσθὴρ, ἕν· Ἰουδεὶθ, ἕν· Μακκαβαίων, τρία· Ἰὼβ, ἕν· Ψαλμοὶ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα· Σολομῶνος βιβλία τρία, Παροιμίαι, Ἐκκλησιαστὴς, Ἆσμα ᾀσμάτων· Προφῆται δεκαέξ. Ἔξωθεν δὲ ὑμῖν προσιστορείσθω μανθάνειν ὑμῶν τοὺς νέους τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Σιράχ· ἡμέτερα δέ, τουτέστι τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, Ματθαίου, Μάρκου, Λουκᾶ, Ἰωάννου· Παύλου ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες· Πέτρου ἐπιστολαὶ δύο· Ἰωάννου, τρεῖς· Ἰακώβου, μία· Ἰούδα, μία· Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολαὶ δύο· καὶ αἱ Διαταγαὶ ὑμῶν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις δι' ἐμοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν ὀκτὼ βιβλίοις προσπεφωνημέναι, [2] [ἅς οὐ χρὴ δημοσιεύειν ἐπὶ πάντων, διὰ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς μυστικά·] καὶ αἱ Πράξεις ἡμῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων.

Ταῦτα δὲ περὶ κανόνων διετάχθη ὑμῖν παρ' ἡμῶν, ὦ ἐπίσκοποι. Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐμμένοντες αὐτοῖς, σωθήσεσθε, καὶ εἰρήνην ἕξετε· ἀπειθοῦντες δὲ, κολασθήσεσθε, καὶ πόλεμον μετ' ἀλλήλων ἀΐδιον ἕξετε, δίκην τῆς ἀνηκοΐας τὴν προσήκουσαν τιννῦντες.

12. Codex Claromontanus.

Codex Claromontanus[1] (Cod. D of Pauline Epp.) contains between the Epistles Philemon and Hebrews a list entitled *Versus Scribturarum Sanctarum,* in which are all the books of the O. T. (with Apocrypha in peculiar order). Its New Testament list is *Evangelia* Mat., Joh., Marc., Luc.; *Epist. Pauli,* ad Romanos, ad Chorintios 1. 2, ad Galatas, ad Efesios, ad Timotheum 1. 2, ad Colosenses, ad Filimonem, ad Petrum 1. 2, Jacobi, Johanni Epist. 1. 2. 3, Judae Epist., Barnabae Epist., Johannis Revelatio, Actus Apostolorum, Pastoris, Actus Pauli, Revelatio Petri.[2]

adds, "quibus plurimi consensum non praebuere facilem." In his collection they were 50 in number; but about 50 years later they were published in Greek, numbering 85, by John Scholasticus, afterwards Patriarch of Constantinople. The Trullan Council in 692 decreed them to be genuine. See Hefele, Hist. of Councils (Eng. trans.), p. 449. The Roman Church accepts 50, the Greek Church 85.

[2] The words ἅς . . . μυστικά are supposed to have been inserted after the Trullan Council. See Credner Gesch. des N. T. Kanon, 235.

[1] See Tischendorf's edition.

[2] This curious list wants both Epp. to Thess., Hebrews, and Philippians, while the MS in which it finds a place contains them all. The date of the Codex is probably of the sixth century. The date and origin of the list can only be con-

13. Anastasius Sinaita.[1]

Περὶ τῶν ξ′ βιβλίων, καὶ ὅσα τούτων ἐκτός.

α′. Γένεσις . . . . . .
λε′. εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, λς′. κατὰ Μάρκον, λζ′. κατὰ Λοῦκαν, λη′. κατὰ Ἰωάννην, λϑ′. Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, μ′. Ἰακώβου Ἐπιστολή, μα′. Πέτρου, μβ′. Πέτρου, μγ′. Ἰωάννου, μδ′. Ἰωάννου, με′. Ἰωάννου, μς′. Ἰούδα, μζ′. Παύλου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, μη′. πρὸς Κορινθίους, μϑ′. πρὸς Κορινθίους β′, ν′. πρὸς Γαλάτας, να′. πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, νβ′. πρὸς Φιλιππησίους, νγ′. πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς, νδ′. πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, νε′. πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς β′, νς′. πρὸς Τιμόθεον, νζ′. πρὸς Τιμόθεον β′, νη′. πρὸς Τίτον, νϑ′. πρὸς Φιλήμονα, ξ′. πρὸς Ἑβραίους.

Καὶ ὅσα ἔξω τῶν ξ′.

α′. σοφία Σολομῶντος . . . . . .
ι′. Ἠλία ἀποκάλυψις, ια′. Ἡσαΐου ὅρασις.

Καὶ ὅσα ἀπόκρυφα.

α′. Ἀδάμ, β′. Ἐνώχ, γ′. Λαμέχ, δ′. Πατριάρχαι, ε′. Ἰωσὴφ Προσευχή, ς′. Ἐλδὰμ καὶ Μοδάμ, ζ′. Διαθήκη Μωσέως, η′. (wanting), ϑ′. Ψαλμὸν Σολομῶντος, ι′. Ἠλίου ἀπ. κ. τ. λ. ιβ′. Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις, ιγ′. Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις, ιδ′. Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις, ιε′. Ἰακώβου ἱστορία, ις′. Πέτρου ἀποκάλυψις, ιζ′. Περίοδοι καὶ Διδαχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ιη′. Βαρνάβα ἐπιστολή, ιϑ′. Παύλου πράξεις, κ′. Παύλου ἀποκάλυψις, κα′. Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος, κβ′. Ἰγνατίου διδασκαλία, κγ′. Πολυκάρ-

jectured. It would probably be useless to seek to account for omissions in it which are more likely to have arisen from accident or ignorance than from intention or knowledge. Tisch. (Proleg. p. XVI) says that the list was evidently made before there was much discussion of the Canon; that its way of dealing with Hebrews shows that it was made before Augustine's day; and that it was most probably of African origin. But the arguments scarcely apply, for Hebrews is not the only omitted Epistle; and moreover the presence of non-canonical books in Cod. A and in ℵ cannot be reconciled with (say) the Decree of the Council of Laodicea. The presence or absence of books in a special list or MS is not always to be explained by general considerations.

[1] *Anastasius Sinaita*, Patriarch of Antioch, died 599. The Books are divided into three classes: (1) Biblical (60 in number, *i.e.*, 34 of O. T. without Apocr., 26 of N. T. without Apocalypse), (2) Extra Biblical, (3) Apocryphal. In the second class are The Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Maccabees (4), Esther, Judith, Tobit. See Credner Gesch. des N. T. Kanons, p. 240; Westcott Canon, p. 520.

που διδασκαλία, κδ'. Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Βαρνάβαν, κε'. Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθίαν.[3]

14. Trullan Council A.D. 692.[1]

Ἔδοξε καὶ τοῦτο τῇ ἁγίᾳ ταύτῃ συνόδῳ κάλλιστά τε καὶ σπουδαιότατα· ὥστε μένειν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν βεβαίους καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς πρὸς ψυχῶν θεραπείαν καὶ ἰατρείαν παθῶν τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων δεχθέντας καὶ κυρωθέντας, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ παραδοθέντας ἡμῖν ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐνδόξων Ἀποστόλων ὀγδοηκόντα πέντε κανόνας. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς κανόσιν ἐντέταλται δέχεσθαι ἡμᾶς τὰς τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντος Διατάξεις, αἷς τισι πάλαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας νόθα τινὰ καὶ ξένα τῆς εὐσεβείας παρενετέθησαν, τὸ εὐπρεπὲς κάλλος τῶν θείων δογμάτων ἡμῖν ἀμαυρώσαντα, τὴν τῶν τοιούτων Διατάξεων προσφόρως ἀποβολὴν πεποιήμεθα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ χριστιανικωτάτου ποιμνίου οἰκοδομὴν καὶ ἀσφάλειαν· οὐδαμῶς ἐγκρίνοντες τὰ τῆς αἱρετικῆς ψευδολογίας κυήματα, καὶ τῇ γνησίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ὁλοκλήρῳ διδαχῇ παρενείροντες. Ἐπισφραγίζομεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς πάντας ἱεροὺς κανόνας τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐκτεθέντας . . . . [Here come the names of the Councils approved of, among which are those of Nicaea, of Laodicea, and of Carthage. But this Trullan decree is not consistent with itself; *e.g.*, the opinions of Athanasius are approved; but Athanasius includes the Apocalypse in the N. T., while the Apostolical Canons (also approved) excluded the Apocalypse. The Apostolical Canons also included the Clementine Letters and Constitutions, which again excluded the Catholic Epistles.]

15. Nicephorus, A.D. 828.[1]

Ὅσαι εἰσὶ θεῖαι γραφαὶ ἐκκλησιαζόμεναι καὶ κεκανονισμέναι. Καὶ ἡ τούτων στιχομετρία οὕτως . . . . . .

[3] The Apocalypse of John is not in the list anywhere.

[1] The seventh General Council, held at Constantinople. See Notes on Laod. and Carth. Councils.

[1] *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of Constantinople, (died A.D. 828), appended a stichometry to his brief Chronography. His O. T. list has Baruch and wants Esther.

Τῆς νέας διαθήκης.
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον στίχοι ,βφ' [2500].
Εὐαγγ. κατὰ Μάρκον στ. ,β [2000].
Εὐαγγ. κατὰ Λουκᾶν στ. ,βχ' [2600].
Εὐαγγ. κατὰ Ἰωάννην στ. ,βτ' [2300 al. 2003].
Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων στ. ,βω' [2800].
Παύλου ἐπιστολαὶ ιδ', στ. ,ετ' [5300].
Καθολικαὶ ζ', Ἰακώβου α', Πέτρου β', Ἰωάννου γ', Ἰούδα α'.
Ὁμοῦ τῆς νέας διαθήκης βιβλία κ'ς'.

. . . . . .

Καὶ ὅσαι τῆς νέας ἀντιλέγονται.
Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου στίχοι ,αυ' [1400].
Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου στ. τ' [300].
Βαρνάβα ἐπιστολὴ στ. ,ατξ' [1360].
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἑβραίους στ. ,βς' [2200].

. . . . . .

Καὶ ὅσα τῆς νέας ἀπόκρυφα.
Περίοδος Πέτρου στίχοι 'βψν' [2750].
Περίοδος Ἰωάννου στ. ,βχ' [2600].
Περίοδος Θωμᾶν [sic] *στ. ,ατ'* [1300].
Εὐαγγ. κατὰ Θωμᾶν στ. ,ατ' [1300].
Διδαχὴ ἀποστόλων στ. σ' [200].
Κλήμεντος α'. β'. στ. ,βχ' [2600].
Ἰγνατίου, Πολυκάρπου, Ποιμένος καὶ Ἑρμᾶ [sic].

16. Canon of Council of Trent, A.D. 1546.[1]

Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicae Sedis legatis hoc sibi perpetuo ante omnia proponens, ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa evangelii in ecclesia conservetur, quod promissum ante per Prophetas in Scripturis

His list of N. T. Books agrees with our Canon—save that the Apocalypse is not found in that division, but in the second class, or Antilegomena. His list may be an older one revived. His division reminds us of Eusebius's, but instead of ὁμολογούμεναι γραφαί, he speaks of acceptance by the Church, and canonisation. See Credner Gesch. des N. T. Kanon, p. 243; Westcott Canon, p. 522.

[1] Chemnitz, Geneva (1614), Denzinger, Enchiridion (1865); Schaff, Creeds (1877).

sanctis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per suos Apostolos, tanquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae omni creaturae praedicari jussit, perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti (cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor), necnon traditiones illas tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conconservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit ac veneratur. Sacrorum vero librorum indicem, huic decreto adscribendum censuit; ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint qui ab ipsa Synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infra scripti Testamenti Veteris. Quinque Moysis scilicet Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium. Deinde Josue, Judicum, Ruth, quatuor Regum, Paralipomenon duo, Esdrae duo, primus scilicet et secundus, qui dicitur Nehemias, Thobias, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalterium Davidicum CL Psalmorum. Parabolae, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Hieremias, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, duodecim prophetae minores, scilicet Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, duo Machabaeorum, primus scilicet et secundus. Testamenti Novi, quatuor Evangelia, secundum Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, et Joannem, Acta Apostolorum a Luca evangelista conscripta. Quatuordecim epistolae beati Pauli apostoli, scilicet ad Romanos, ad Corinthios duae, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses duae, ad Timotheum duae, ad Titum, ad Philemonem, ad Hebraeos, Petri apostoli duae, Joannis apostoli tres, Jacobi una, Judae apostoli una, et Apocalypsis Joannis apostoli. Si quis autem libros ipsos integros, cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit: et traditiones praedictas sciens et prudens contempserit: anathema sit.

The Council of Trent also (Sessio 4, April 8, 1546) fixed the text of scripture as in the Vulgate Edition:

[2] Insuper eadem S. S. Synodus considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesiae Dei si ex omnibus latinis editionibus quae circumferuntur sacrorum librorum quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot sacculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat . . . . decrevit et statuit ut posthac Scriptura Sacra, potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quam emendatissime imprimatur.[3]

17. Old Catholic Union[1] Theses. 1874.

Art. I. We agree that the apocryphal or deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament are not of the same canonicity as the books contained in the Hebrew canon.

Art. III. We agree that the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue cannot be lawfully forbidden.

Art. IX. The Holy Scriptures being recognized as the primary rule of Faith, we agree that the genuine tradition *i.e.*, the unbroken transmission,—partly oral, partly in writing,—

[2] See Denzinger Enchiridion, p. 226. Reuss, Geschichte, § 482. Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, p. 82.

[3] There is controversy as to the precise scope of this decree. It is pleaded on the one hand that it only singles out the Vulgate from other Latin editions: and decrees that a correct edition of it shall be published forthwith. It is represented on the other hand that the attempts of successive Popes [Sixtus V. 1590, Clement VIII. 1592] to publish a standard edition show the object of the decree to have been the fixing of the text of Scripture as against all comers. The decree is certainly not so clear as Protestants sometimes represent it to be. But there can be little freedom when any Latin text of the Vulgate is held as "authentic" in all public controversies. Compare the prohibition of reading Scripture in the Vulgar tongue except when special permission has been obtained (Pius IV. 1564). The Clementine Vulgate, which was so soon needed to supersede the edition of the Pope two years before, is still the standard in the Romish Church.

[1] A conference of "Old Catholics," "Orthodox Russians and Greeks," "English Episcopalians" and "American Episcopalians" held at Bonn in 1874 under the presidency of Dr Döllinger, agreed upon certain Articles as embodying their common belief. (See Schaff, Greek and Latin Creeds, p. 545.) The English is authoritative. The Theses are given here, as bearing on the previous Extract, though they are of later date than the Extracts which follow.

of the doctrine delivered by Christ and the Apostles, is an authoritative [2] source of teaching for all successive generations of Christians. This tradition is partly to be found in the consensus of the great ecclesiastical bodies standing in historical continuity with the primitive Church, partly to be gathered by scientific method from the written documents of all centuries.

18. Cyril Lukar's Confession.[1]

Ἱερὰν γραφὴν ποῖα βιβλία καλεῖς;[2]

Ἱερὰν γραφὴν πάντα τὰ κανονικὰ βιβλία λέγομεν, ἅπερ ὡς κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας παρελάβομεν καὶ κρατοῦμεν, μάλισθ' ὅτι θεόπνευστον ἡμῖν προβάλλονσι τὴν διδασκαλίαν, καὶ αὐτάρκη κατηχῆσαι, φωτίσαι καὶ τελειῶσαι τὸν τῇ πίστει προσερχόμενον. Ταῦτα δὲ τὰ κανονικὰ βιβλία τοσαῦτα τὸν ἀριθμὸν εἶναι πιστεύομεν, ὅσα ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος ἀπεφήνατο, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ὀρθόδοξος ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος φωτισθεῖσα μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος ὑπαγορεύει. Ἅπερ δὲ ἀπόκρυφα λέγομεν, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἐπώνυμον οὕτως ἔχουσιν, ὅτι τὸ κῦρος παρὰ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὡς τὰ κυρίως καὶ ἀναμφιβόλως κανονικὰ βιβλία, ἐν οἷς ἡ τοῦ Μωϋσέως πεντάτευχος, καὶ τὰ ἁγιόγραφα καὶ οἱ προφῆται,

[2] German: Eine autoritative (gottgewollte) Erkenntnissquelle.

[1] For the views of the Greek Church on Canonicity see Introduction. The following note may give an outline. Cyril Lukar, a native of Crete, was successively Patriarch of Alexandria and of Constantinople. He published his "*Orientalium Professio*" at Geneva (Latin in 1629, Greek in 1633). This "Professio" was too Protestant in its tone for the Eastern Church, in name of which it was issued; and accordingly it was denounced as Calvinistic by the "Council of Jerusalem," which met in 1672. Of that Council Dositheos was President, and his Confession and Catechism were adopted. Cyril had proclaimed the supremacy of Scripture and the right of every man to read the Word of God; Dositheos made Scripture and the Church equal, and canonized those books of the O. T. which Cyril "stupidly termed Apocrypha." His manifestoes were regarded as the voice of the Eastern Church on the subject of the Canon until 1839, when Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, published a Catechism which is now generally used in Russian schools and churches. This Catechism, while it exalts tradition as a guide to the understanding of the Scripture and to the observance of a proper ritual, nevertheless makes Scripture indispensable for securing the unchangeableness of revelation. The Catalogue of O. T. Books is explicitly made to correspond with the Hebrew Canon; and the N. T. agrees with our Canon, Hebrews being ascribed to Paul.

[2] From Kimmel, Lib. Symb. Ecc. Or. p. 42.

ἅτινα ὥρισεν ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος, ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία εἴκοσι δύο· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς νέας πλουτοῦμεν τοὺς τέσσαρας εὐαγγελιστὰς, τὰς πράξεις, τὰς ἐπιστολὰς μακαρίου Παύλου, καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς αἷς συνάπτομεν καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ ἠγαπημένου. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἶναι τὰ κανονικὰ βιβλία κρατοῦμεν καὶ ταῦτα ἱερὰν γραφὴν λέγεσθαι ὁμολογοῦμεν.

19. Council of Jerusalem, March 1672.[1]

Dosithei Confessio.

Ἐρώτησις γ'. Ἱερὰν γραφὴν ποῖα βιβλία καλεῖς;

Στοιχοῦντες τῷ κανόνι τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἱερὰν γραφὴν καλοῦμεν ἐκεῖνα πάντα, ἅπερ ὁ Κύριλλος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ συνόδου ἐρανισάμενος ἀριθμεῖ. Καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἅπερ ἀσυνέτως καὶ ἀμαθῶς, εἴτ' οὖν ἐθελοκακούργως, ἀπόκρυφα κατωνόμασε· τὴν Σοφίαν δηλαδὴ τοῦ Σολομῶντος, τὴν Ἰουδὴθ, τὸν Τωβίαν, τὴν Ἱστορίαν τοῦ δράκοντος, τὴν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Σωσάννης, τοὺς Μακκαβαίους, καὶ τὴν Σοφίαν τοῦ Σειράχ. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς θείας γραφῆς γνησίων βιβλίων καὶ ταῦτα γνήσια τῆς γραφῆς μέρη κρίνομεν, ὅτι ἡ παραδόσασα ἀρχαία συνήθεια καὶ μάλιστα ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία γνήσια εἶναι τὰ ἱερὰ εὐαγγέλια καὶ τ' ἄλλα τῆς γραφῆς βιβλία, καὶ ταῦτα εἶναι τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς μέρη ἀναμφιβόλως παρέδωκε· καὶ τούτων ἡ ἄρνησις ἐκείνων ἐστὶν ἀθέτησις. Εἰ δέ που δοκεῖ μὴ ἀεὶ πάντα ὑπὸ πάντων συγκαταριθμεῖσθαι, οὐδὲν ἧττον ὅμως καὶ ταῦτα παρά τε συνόδων καὶ πολλῶν ὅσων τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παλαιοτάτων τε καὶ ἐγκρίτων Θεολόγων ἀριθμεῖται καὶ συγκαταριθμεῖται τῇ πάσῃ γραφῇ, ἃ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς κανονικὰ βιβλία κρίνομεν, καὶ ταῦτα τὴν ἱερὰν γραφὴν εἶναι ὁμολογοῦμεν.

20. Philaret's Longer Catechism[1] of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church, Moscow, 1839.

(Question) 16. How is divine revelation spread among men and preserved in the true Church?

By two channels—holy tradition and holy Scripture.

[1] Kimmel, p. 467. The same Council sanctioned Mogilas' Confession (1633).
[1] See Schaff, Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches, p. 445.

17. What is meant by the name *holy tradition?*

By the name holy tradition is meant the doctrine of the faith, the law of God, the sacraments, and the ritual as handed down by the true believers and worshippers of God by word and example from one to another, and from generation to generation.

18. Is there any sure repository of holy tradition?

All true believers united by the doctrine of the faith, collectively and successively, by the will of God, compose the Church; and she is the sure repository of holy tradition, or as St. Paul expresses it, "*The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth*"—1 Tim. iii. 15.

St. Irenaeus writes thus: "We ought not to seek among others the truth, which we may have for asking from the Church: for in her, as in a rich treasure house, the Apostles have laid up in its fulness all that pertains to the truth, so that whosoever seeketh may receive from her the food of life. She is the door of life." (Adv. Haeres. lib. III. c. 4.)

19. What is that which you call *holy Scripture?*

Certain books written by the Spirit of God through men sanctified by God, called Prophets and Apostles. These books are commonly termed the Bible.

20. What does the word *Bible* mean?

It is Greek, and means *the books.* The name signifies that the sacred books deserve attention before all others.

21. Which is the more ancient, holy tradition or holy Scripture?

The most ancient and original instrument for spreading divine revelation is holy tradition. . . . . The necessity of tradition is further evident from this, that books can be available only to a small part of mankind, but tradition to all.

22.—Why, then, was holy Scripture given?

To this end, that divine revelation might be preserved more exactly and unchangeably. In holy Scripture we read the words of the Prophets and Apostles precisely as if we were living with them and listening to them,

although the latest of the sacred books were written a thousand and some hundred years before our time.

23. Must we follow holy tradition, even when we possess holy Scripture?

We must follow that tradition which agrees with the divine revelation and with holy Scripture, as is taught us by holy Scripture itself. The Apostle Paul writes: "*Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle*"—2 Thess. ii. 15.

31. How many are the books of the Old Testament?

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Athanasius the Great, and St. John Damascene reckon them at *twenty-two,* agreeing therein with the Jews, who so reckon them in the original Hebrew tongue. (Athanas. Ep. XXXIX de Test., J. Damasc. Theol. lib. IV. c. 17.)

34. Why is there no notice taken in this enumeration [the enumeration of St. Cyril and St. Athanasius] of the books of the Old Testament, of the book of the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, and of certain others?

Because they do not exist in the Hebrew.

35. How are we to regard these last named books?

Athanasius the Great says that they have been appointed of the Fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the Church.

44. How many are the books of the New Tetament?

Twenty-seven.

LUTHERAN TESTIMONY.

21. Formula Concordiae. 1577.[1]

Art. I.

1. Credimus, confitemur et docemus, unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque doctores aestimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse,

[1] First published at Dresden, and translated into Latin by Osiander, 1580; the authorized text 1584. See Hase, Libri symbolici, p. 570, and Proleg., p. CXXI. Schaff's Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches, p. 93.

quam Prophetica et Apostolica scripta cum Veteris, tum Novi Testamenti, sicut scriptum est: Ps. cxix. 105. Et Divus Paulus inquit Gal. i. 8: *Etiamsi* &c.

2. Reliqua vero sive patrum sive neotericorum scripta, quocunque veniant nomine, sacris literis nequaquam sunt aequiparanda, sed universa illis ita subjicienda sunt, ut alia ratione non recipiantur, nisi testium loco, qui doceant, quod etiam post Apostolorum tempora, et in quibus partibus orbis, doctrina illa Prophetarum et Apostolorum sincerior conservata sit.

7. Hoc modo luculentum discrimen inter sacras Veteris et Novi Testamenti literas, et omnia aliorum scripta retinetur: et sola Sacra Scriptura judex, norma et regula agnoscitur, ad quam, ceu ad Lydium lapidem, omnia dogmata exigenda sunt et judicanda, an pia, an impia, an vera, an vero falsa sint.

8. Caetera autem Symbola, et alia scripta, quorum paulo ante mentionem fecimus, non obtinent auctoritatem judicis: haec enim dignitas solis sacris literis debetur: sed duntaxat pro religione nostra testimonium dicunt eamque explicant, ac ostendunt, quomodo singulis temporibus sacrae literae in articulis controversis in ecclesia Dei a doctoribus, qui tum vixerunt, intellectae et explicatae fuerint, et quibus rationibus dogmata cum Sacra Scriptura pugnantia rejecta et condemnata sint.

REFORMED CONFESSIONS.

22. Conf. Basil.[1] (Posterior) or Conf. Helvet. (Prior). 1536.

German. Die heilge götliche biblische gschrifft die da ist das wort gottes, von dem helgen geist inggeben, und durch die propheten und apostell der welt fürgetragen, ist die aller älteste volkomnste und höchste leer, begrifft allein alles das, das zu warer erkanntnüss liebe und eer gottes, zu rechter warer fromkeit, und anrichtung eines frōmen eerbaren und gottsäligen lebens dienet.[2]

[1] The Conf. Bas. Prior 1530 or 1531 has no chapter on Scripture.

[2] Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 105. This Confession was made by

Latin. Scriptura Canonica verbum dei, Spiritu S. tradita, et per prophetas apostolosque mundo proposita, omnium perfectissima antiquissima Philosophia, pietatem omnem, omnem vitae rationem sola perfecte continet.[3]

23. Confessio Helvetica Posterior.[1] 1566.

Art. 1. Credimus et confitemur, Scripturas Canonicas sanctorum Prophetarum et Apostolorum utriusque Testamenti ipsum verum esse verbum Dei, et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis, non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipse loquutus est Patribus, Prophetis, et Apostolis, et loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas Sanctas.

24. Confessio Fidei Gallicana.[1] 1559.

(Confession of La Rochelle, 1571.)

French. Art. IV. Nous connaissons ces livres être canoniques, et la règle très certaine de notre foi non tant par le commun accord et consentement de l'Eglise, que par le temoignage et persuasion intérieure du Saint-Esprit, qui nous les fait discerner d'avec les autres livres ecclésiastiques, sur lesquels, encore qu'ils soient utiles, on ne peut fonder aucun article de foi.

Art. V. Nous croyons que la Parole qui est contenue en ces livres, est procédée de Dieu, duquel seul elle prend son autorité, et non des hommes. Et d'autant qu'elle est la règle de toute vérité, contenant tout ce qui est nécessaire pour le service de Dieu et de notre salut, il n'est pas loisible aux hommes, ni même aux Anges, d'y ajouter, diminuer, ou changer. D'où il s'ensuit que ni

Bullinger, Leo Judae, and others. It was the first which represented the faith of all the Reformed Swiss Cantons. The German and Latin versions do not verbally agree, though both are authoritative.

[3] Niemeyer, p. 115.

[1] Schaff, Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches, p. 236.

[1] Prepared by Calvin and De Chandieu; revised and approved by a Synod at Paris 1559; delivered by Beza to Charles IX at Poissy, 1561; adopted by the Synod of La Rochelle, 1571, and sanctioned by Henry IV. It is known as the Confession of Rochelle. See Schaff, p. 356.

l'antiquité, ni les coutumes, ni la multitude, ni la sagesse humaine, ni les jugements, ni les arrêts, ni les édits, ni les décrets, ni les conciles, ni les visions, ni les miracles, ne doivent être opposés à cette Ecriture sainte, mais, au contraire, toutes choses doivent être examinées réglées et réformées selon elle.

25. Old Scottish Confession.[1] 1560.

[After a statement of the marks of the true "kirks of God".]

Art. 18. And sik kirks, we the inhabitantis of the Realme of *Scotland,* professoris of *Christ Jesus,* professis our selfis to have in our citties, towns and places reformed, for the doctrine taucht in our kirkis, conteined in the written Worde of God, to wit, in the buiks of the Auld and New Testamentis, in those buikis we meane quhilk of the ancient have been reputed canonicall.

Art. 19. "As we beleeve and confesse the Scriptures of God sufficient to instruct and make the man of God perfite, so do we affirme and avow the authoritie of the same to be of God, and nether to depend on men nor angelis. We affirme therefore that sik as allege the Scripture to have na uther authoritie but that quhilk it hes received from the kirk to be blasphemous against God, and injurious to the trew kirk, quhilk alwaies heares and obeyis the voice of her awin Spouse and pastor (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17) but takis not upon her to be maistres over the samin."[2]

26. Confessio Bohoemica[1]. 1535.

Art. I. Principio nostri omnes unanimi consensu docent scripturas sacras quae in Bibliis ipsis continentur, et a patribus receptae auctoritateque Canonica donatae sunt, pro inconcusse veris certissimisque habendas.

[1] Published in 1560; afterwards translated into Latin.
[2] Dunlop's Confessions, II. 13.
[1] Niemeyer, Coll. Conf. p. 787.

27. Anglican Articles of Religion. 1562.

Art. VI. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.[1] [Here follow the Books of the O. T.]

And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine: such are these following. [Here follow the Books of the O. T. Apocrypha.]

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.[2]

28. Westminster Confession of Faith. 1643-1647.

II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these—

(Here follow the names of the Books)

all which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.

III. The Books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than any other human writings.

IV. The authority of the holy Scripture for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the

[1] So also the Conf. Wirtembergica: Sacram Scripturam vocamus eos canonicos libros V. et N. T. de quorum autoritate in ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est. But the Antilegomena are excluded from its list. (Reuss, Gesch. § 335.)

[2] There is no list of the Canonical Books of the N. T.

Church to an high and reverend esteem of the holy Scripture, and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole, (which is to give all glory to God,) the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God: yet notwithstanding our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE.

1. Ignatius.

Philad. 5. *Ἀλλ᾽ ἡ προσευχὴ ὑμῶν εἰς Θεόν με ἀπαρτίσει, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ κλήρῳ ἠλεήθην ἐπιτύχω, προσφυγὼν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας. Καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίζειν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναμένειν· ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν, ἐν ἑνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες, ἀξιαγάπητοι καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστοι ἅγιοι, ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεμαρτυρημένοι καὶ συνηριθμημένοι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος.*[1]

Philad. 8. *[2]Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, μηδὲν κατ᾽ ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χριστομαθίαν· ἐπεὶ ἤκουσά τινων λεγόντων,*

[1] "Prophets" here must mean the Prophetic authors of Books in the O. T. "Gospel" probably means the contents of the Gospel; and the "Apostles" we take to mean the apostolic founders of the Christian Church. These last renderings are indefinite; but there are objections to any more definite interpretation of the phrases used. At a later time "the Gospel" and "the Apostle" were familiar terms, indicating the two great subdivisions of the New Testament; but we want authority for ascribing that meaning to so early a writer as Ignatius. He probably meant by "Gospel" to denote the Christian truth contained in Christ's life, whether conveyed in writing or orally; and by "Apostles" to indicate a reference to their writings, and at the same time to their traditional arrangements in and for the Church. Elsewhere he likens the Presbytery to the synod or Sanhedrim of Apostles (Magnesians c. 6; Trallians c. 2 and c. 3): and he seems here to speak of the Apostles as a perpetual Presbytery whose opinion on all difficulties was easily obtained and was to be implicitly followed. The following Extracts from the Smyrnaean Epistle seem to be consistent with this rendering; and to make the other from the Philadelphian more easily intelligible. Lardner (citing on the same side Grabe, Mill and Le Clerc) "understands by the 'Gospel' the book or volume of the Gospels; by 'the Apostles' the book or volume of their Epistles; as by 'the Prophets' the volume or whole canon of the New Testament." See Lardner vol. I. p. 322.

[2] The readings in this difficult passage vary; ἀρχαῖα, ἄθηκτα, οὐ πρόκειται, being found. By using ἀρχεῖα (archives) a consistent meaning is given. It appears that Ignatius, in disputing with certain adversaries—heretics—found that they insisted on appealing to the Archives—to the original Gospel records; and that when he said "It is written," they retorted that this did not close the controversy (πρόκειται, *i.e.*, that is the point in dispute). Whereupon he recapitulates the main facts on record which those heretics appear to have denied. It is clear, therefore, that at this period disputants on both sides *appealed to written standards.* It may be doubtful whether both appealed to the same standards; but it seems most probable that they did, and that they differed as to the interpretations. The

ὅτι "ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις εὕρω, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, οὐ πιστεύω·" Καὶ λέγοντός μου αὐτοῖς, ὅτι "γέγραπται·" ἀπεκρίθησάν μοι, ὅτι "πρόκειται." Ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖά ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα ὁ σταυρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ· ἐν οἷς θέλω ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν δικαιωθῆναι.

Old Latin version. Deprecor autem vos, nihil secundum contentionem facere, sed secundum Christi disciplinam; quia audivi quosdam dicentes quoniam si non in veteribus invenio, in Evangelio non credo. Et dicente me ipsis, quoniam scriptum est, responderunt mihi, quoniam praejacet. Mihi autem principium est Jesus Christus; inapproximabilia principia crux ipsius et mors, et resurrectio ipsius, et fides quae per ipsum; in quibus volo in oratione vestra justificari.

Philad. 9. Ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Οἱ γὰρ ἀγαπητοὶ προφῆται κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας.

Smyrn. 5. Οὓς οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι, οὐδὲ ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν κατ' ἄνδρα παθήματα.

Smyrn. 7. Πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν . . . προσέχειν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται.

2. Melito.

Eus. H. E. IV. 26.

Μελίτων Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν. Ἐπειδὴ πολλάκις ἠξίωσας σπουδῇ τῇ πρὸς τὸν λόγον χρώμενος, γενέσθαι σοι ἐκλογὰς ἔκ τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων ἐβουλήθης ἀκρίβειαν, πόσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ὁποῖα τὴν τάξιν εἶεν, ἐσπούδασα τὸ τοιοῦτο πρᾶξαι, ἐπιστάμενός σου τὸ σπουδαῖον περὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ φιλομαθὲς περὶ τὸν λόγον, ὅτι

reading οὐ πρόκειται may perhaps have been intended to say that such standard writings 'are not extant,' or that the subject is not mentioned. But the other reading seems to fit better into what follows.

μάλιστα πάντων πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς Θεὸν ταῦτα προκρίνεις, περὶ τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας ἀγωνιζόμενος. Ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν, καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη, καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία, ὑποτάξας ἔπεμψά σοι.[1] [Here follow the Books of O. T., omitting Esther; and then he adds] *Ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὰς ἐκλογὰς ἐποιησάμην εἰς ἓξ βιβλία διελών.*

3. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth.[1]

Eus. H. E. IV. 23.

Ἔτι δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιστολῶν ὡς ῥᾳδιουργηθεισῶν, ταῦτα φησίν. "Ἐπιστολὰς γὰρ ἀδελφῶν ἀξιωσάντων με

[1] The force of this passage lies in the inference that a new collection of books was known from which the Old Testament ("The old Books") was distinguished. Eusebius begins the chapter by enumerating the works of Melito upon various subjects of Christian philosophy and theology, among which he names a work "on the Apocalypse of John." He was bishop of Sardis in the time of Marcus Aurelius. The author of Supernatural Religion, II. 17 (and Sanday agrees so far with him) points to 2 Cor. iii. 6. 14 ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης as proof that the "Old Covenant" is a phrase referring to "the doctrinal view," not to the Books. But this does not dispose of the argument founded on τὰ παλαιὰ βιβλία as connected with ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη. Does the author of Sup. Rel. mean that there were no Books in the time of Melito recognized as containing the New Covenant? He says the date of Melito falls after A.D. 176; and if so, such a contention is impossible. There is not much known of his date except that his Apology was addressed to the Emperor in A.D. 170. Polycrates (in Eus. H. E. V. 24), in his letter to Victor, speaks of him as buried in Sardis, and terms him "Μελίτωνα τὸν εὐνοῦχον, τὸν ἐν Ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον," and there has been much controversy as to whether he was literally or metaphorically a eunuch. On Melito and his writings see Donaldson, Hist. of Christian Literature and Doctrine, III. 221.

[1] Dionysius was Bishop of Corinth about A.D. 170. The extract is from his letter to the Romans. The question here is whether by τῶν κυριακῶν γραφῶν he means the N. T. Scripture (see Lardner), the Gospels (see Donaldson), or (as held in Sup. Rel. II. 166) "the Scriptures of the Old Testament." For this last no authority is adduced; and it is idle to refer to Justin's accumulation of O. T. Scriptures predicting Christ. The author goes on (Sup. Rel. II. p. 167) to show that Serapion found the Gospel of Peter in the third century in Rhosse, and that Theodoret found (423) Tatian's Diatessaron "in esteem in our Churches;" but this argument tells against himself. Such books were found here and there over the Church; but the question is whether there was all the while a consent of the Church as a whole in favour of our N. T. Books. No one can deny that there was such consent long before the fifth century. To prove that other than Canonical Books existed in the time of Dionysius is superfluous; and if the writer's argument is valid in establishing a parallel between the case at that date and the case in the fifth century, it would prove that the Church as a whole had at both dates a Canon, although in some localities special favour was shown to uncanonical books. Eusebius gives another quotation from Dionysius in the same chapter, stating that the Epistle of Clement was daily read on the Lord's Day in

γράψαι, ἔγραψα. Καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόστολοι ζιζανίων γεγέμικαν, ἃ μὲν ἐξαροῦντες, ἃ δὲ προσιθέντες. Οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κεῖται. Οὐ θαυμαστὸν ἄρα, εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥᾳδιουργῆσαί τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν, ὁπότε καὶ ταῖς οὐ τοιαύταις ἐπιβεβλήκασι."

4. Irenaeus.

B. I. 3. 6. Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν[1] πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιεῖσθαι, παρατρέποντες τὰς ἑρμηνείας, καὶ ῥᾳδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν. . . . . δεινῶς τῷ πλάσματι αὐτῶν καὶ δολίως ἐφαρμόζοντες αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τοὺς μὴ ἑδραίαν τὴν πίστιν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πάτερα παντοκράτορα καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διαφυλάσσοντας.

B. I. 6. 3. Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὰ ἀπειρημένα πάντα ἀδεῶς οἱ τελειότατοι πράττουσιν αὐτῶν, περὶ ὧν καὶ γραφαὶ διαβεβαιοῦνται, τοὺς ποιοῦντας αὐτὰ βασιλείαν Θεοῦ μὴ κληρονομήσειν.[2] Καὶ γὰρ εἰδωλόθυτα διαφόρως ἐσθίουσι, μηδὲ μολύνεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἡγούμενοι.

B. II. 35. 4. Quoniam autem dictis nostris consonat *praedicatio apostolorum* et *domini magisterium* et prophetarum annuntiatio et *apostolorum dictatio* et legislationis ministratio unum eundemque omnium deum patrem laudantium. . . . Sed ne putemur fugere illam, quae ex Scripturis dominicis est probationem, ipsis Scripturis multo manifestius et clarius hoc ipsum praedicantibus, his tamen qui non prave intendunt eis proprium librum, qui sequitur has Scripturas, reddentes ex Scripturis divinis probationes apponemus in medio omnibus amantibus veritatem.

Corinth; and if so, the supremacy of Paul's doctrine was recognized. [See Introduction: Clement.] More important is it to compare the words of Dionysius with those of his contemporaries Melito and Irenaeus, quoted in our text regarding "Scripture of the Lord." Eusebius devotes a chapter (H. E. IV. 23) to Dionysius, and we learn from it that he wrote many "Catholic Epistles" to other Churches than his own. His letter to the Romans was written while Soter was Bishop.

[1] These words point to a collection of "evangelical" and "apostolical" writings. The extracts show that Irenaeus called the New Testament "Scriptures," like the Old. See also "*Dominicis Scripturis* enutriri" (V. 20. 2). We have also θεῖαι γραφαί (apparently referring to both Testaments), (II. 27. 1.) He quotes also from the Presbyters (IV. 32. 1) special testimony to the unity of the two Testaments.

[2] The reference here is to the morals of the heretics, and the reference to Gal. v. 21 is maintained by the second clause.

B. III. 4. 1. 2. Quid autem si neque apostoli quidem *scripturas* reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multae gentes barbarorum eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charta et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes.

Ep. ad Florin. (Eus. H. E. V. 20). *Ἐν ᾗ γε μὴν προειρήκαμεν πρὸς τὸν Φλωρῖνον ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐπιστολῇ, αὖθις τῆς ἅμα Πολυκάρπῳ συνουσίας αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει, λέγων.* ". . . *Καὶ ὡς* [*Πολύκαρπος*] *ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν* [sc. *τῶν ἑωρακότων τὸν Κύριον*] *καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κύριου τίνα ἦν ἃ παρ' ἐκείνων ἀκηκόει, καὶ περὶ τῶν δυναμέων αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὡς παρὰ αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρειληφὼς ὁ Πολύκαρπος, ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς.*"

5. Tertullian.[1]

De praescript. haereticor. c. 30. Si enim Marcion Novum Testamentum a Vetere separavit, posterior est eo quod separavit; quia separare non posset, nisi quod unitum fuit.

Ibid. c. 32. Ita omnes haereses ad utramque formam a nostris Ecclesiis provocatae, probent se quaqua putant apostolicas. Sed

[1] Tertullian: born about A.D. 160, died A.D. 220-240. He was a native of Carthage, a married man, and (according to Jerome) a Presbyter. It is not certain where he exercised his functions as Presbyter. In his later days he became a Montanist, driven (says Jerome) from the Church by the harsh usage of the Roman clergy. Some of his works were written after he left the Church. These facts are almost all we know of his outer life. His character is written in his books, impetuous, eloquent, sarcastic, an advocate rather than a judge. His aim was to defend Christianity against the unworthy suspicions both of the rulers and the ruled. So in his Apology he maintained against the heathen that Christians had purer lives than they; in his '*Adv. Judaeos*' he proved the superiority of the Gospel to the law; in his '*De praescriptione haereticorum*' he showed how Catholic Christians should deal with heretics; in his treatise '*Adv. Marcionem*' he exposed the assumptions of the Gnostics. It is to be borne in mind that with all his impetuosity he wrote systematically, and quoted very largely from Scripture. In his treatises *De Resurrectione*, *De Pudicitiâ*, and *Adv. Marcionem* he cites in regular sequence the Scripture passages bearing on the subject in hand. When therefore he does not quote a passage or a book which we know to bear on his subject, we may infer that he did not know it or did not use it. He uses all the N. T. but James, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John. Hebrews was not, however, part of the Canon of the African Church, as is obvious from his mode of citation (see below: 'Hebrews'). He quotes Jude as establishing the place of Enoch. See Rönsch: Das Neue Testament Tertullians, for a compilation of his quotations.

adeo nec sunt, nec probare possunt quod non sunt, nec recipiuntur in pacem et communicationem ab Ecclesiis quoquo modo apostolicis; scilicet ob diversitatem sacramenti nullo modo apostolicae.

Ibid. c. 33. Adhibeo super haec ipsarum doctrinarum recognitionem, quae tunc sub apostolis fuerunt, ab iisdem apostolis et demonstratae et dejeratae. Nam et sic facilius traducentur: dum aut jam tunc fuisse deprehenduntur, aut ex illis quae jam tunc fuerunt, seminia sumpsisse. Paulus in prima ad Corinthios (xv. 12) notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis. Haec opinio propria Sadducaeorum; partem ejus usurpat Marcion, et Apelles, et Valentinus, et si qui alii resurrectionem carnis infringunt. Et ad Galatas (v. 2) scribens, invehitur in observatores et defensores circumcisionis et legis: Hebionis haeresis sic est. Timotheum instruens (1 Tim. iv. 3), nuptiarum quoque interdictores suggillat: ita instituunt Marcion, et Apelles ejus secutor. Aeque tangit eos, qui dicerent *factam jam resurrectionem* (2 Tim. ii. 3): id de se Valentiniani adseverant. Sed et cum *genealogias indeterminatas* nominat (1 Tim. i. 4), Valentinus agnoscitur: apud quem Aeon ille nescio qui novi, et non unius nominis, generat e sua Charite Sensum et Veritatem: et hi aeque procreant ex se Sermonem et Vitam, dehinc et isti generant Hominem et Ecclesiam: de qua prima ogdoade aeonum. Exinde decem alii, et duodecim reliqui aeones miris nominibus oriuntur, in meram fabulam triginta aeonum. Idem apostolus, cum improbat elementis servientes, aliquid Hermogenis ostendit, qui materiam non natam introducens, Deo non nato eam comparat, et ita matrem elementorum deam faciens, potest ei servire quam Deo comparat. Joannes vero, in Apocalypsi (ii. 20), *idolothyta edentes et stupra committentes* jubetur castigare: sunt et nunc alii Nicolaitae, Gaiana haeresis dicitur. At in *epistola* eos maxime antichristos vocat, qui Christum negarent in carnem venisse, et qui non putarent Jesum esse Filium Dei: illud Marcion, hoc Hebion vindicavit. Simonianae autem magiae disciplina, angelis serviens, utique et ipsa inter idololatrias deputabatur, et a Petro apostolo in ipso Simone damnabatur.

Ibid. c. 34. Haec sunt, ut arbitror, genera doctrinarum adulterinarum, quae sub apostolis fuisse ab ipsis apostolis discimus:

et tamen nullam invenimus institutionem, inter tot diversitates perversitatum, quae de Deo creatore universorum controversiam moverit. Nemo alterum Deum ausus est suspicari.

Ibid. c. 36. Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuae, percurre Ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident,[2] apud quas ipsae authenticae literae[3] eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est. Ista quam felix Ecclesia! cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni Dominicae adaequatur; ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur; ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam, in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur; videamus quid didicerit, quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque Ecclesiis contesserarit. Unum Deum Dominum novit, Creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex Virgine Maria, Filium Dei Creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem: *legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis literis miscet,* et inde potat fidem.

Ibid. c. 37. Si haec ita se habent, ut veritas nobis adjudicetur, quicumque in ea regula incedimus quam Ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo tradidit, constat ratio propositi nostri, definientis non esse admittendos haereticos ad incundam de Scripturis provocationem, quos sine Scripturis probamus ad Scripturas non pertinere. Si enim haeretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt, non a Christo habendo quod de sua electione sectati haereticorum nomine admittunt. Ita non Christiani, nullum jus capiunt Christianarum literarum. Ad quos merito dicendum est: qui estis? quando, et unde venistis? quid in meo agitis, non mei? quo denique, Marcion, jure silvam meam caedis? qua licentia, Valentine, fontes meos transvertis? qua potestate, Apelles, limites meos commoves? Quid hic caeteri ad voluntatem vestram seminatis et pascitis? Mea est possessio; olim

[2] Al. praesidentur.

[3] The meaning of "authenticae" is disputed. Original? unchanged? well warranted by usage and testimony? See following extract from *De Monogamiâ* for the same word.

possideo: habeo origines firmas, ab ipsis auctoribus quorum fuit res. Ego sum haeres apostolorum. Sicut caverunt testamento suo, sicut fidei commiserunt, sicut adjuraverunt, ita teneo. Vos certe exhaeredaverunt semper et abdicaverunt, ut extraneos, ut inimicos. Unde autem extranei et inimici apostolis haeretici, nisi ex diversitate doctrinae, quam unusquisque de suo arbitrio, adversus apostolos aut protulit, aut recepit?

Ibid. c. 38. Illic igitur et Scripturarum et expositionum adulteratio deputanda est, ubi diversitas doctrinae invenitur. Quibus fuit propositum aliter docendi, eos necessitas coëgit aliter disponendi instrumenta doctrinae. Alias enim non potuissent aliter docere, nisi aliter haberent per quae docerent. Sicut illis non potuisset succedere corruptela doctrinae sine corruptela instrumentorum ejus; ita et nobis integritas doctrinae non competisset sine integritate eorum, per quae doctrina tractatur. Etenim quid contrarium nobis in nostris? quid de proprio intulimus, ut aliquid contrarium ei quod esset in Scripturis deprehensum, detractione, vel adjectione, vel transmutatione remediaremus? Quod sumus, hoc sunt Scripturae ab initio suo; ex illis sumus, antequam aliter fuit, antequam a vobis interpolarentur. Cum autem omnis interpolatio posterior credenda sit, veniens utique ex causa aemulationis, quae neque prior, neque domestica unquam est ejus quod aemulatur, tam incredibile est sapienti cuique, ut nos adulterum stilum intulisse videamur Scripturis, qui sumus a principio et primi, quam illos non intulisse qui sunt et posteri et adversi. Alius manu Scripturas, alius sensus expositione intervertit. Neque enim, si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exserte et palam machaera, non stilo usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam caedem Scripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit, quoniam non ad materiam Scripturas, sed materiam ad Scripturas excogitavit: et tamen plus abstulit, et plus adjecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum, et adjiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum.

Adv. Marcionem, IV. 1. Omnem sententiam et omnem paraturam impii atque sacrilegi Marcionis ad ipsum jam Evangelium ejus provocamus, quod interpolando suum fecit. Et ut fidem instrueret, dotem quamdam commentatus est illi, opus ex

contrarietatum oppositionibus, *Antitheses* cognominatum, et ad separationem Legis et Evangelii coactum, qua duos deos dividens, proinde diversos, alterum alterius Instrumenti, vel (quod magis usui est dicere) Testamenti; ut exinde Evangelio quoque secundum antitheses credendo patrocinaretur.

Apologeticum, c. 31. Adolati nunc sumus imperatori et mentiti vota, quae diximus, ad evadendam scilicet vim. Plane proficit ista fallacia. Admittis nos enim probare quodcunque defendimus. Qui ergo putaveris nihil nos de salute Caesarum curare, inspice Dei voces, literas nostras, quas neque ipsi supprimimus et plerique casus ad extraneos transferunt. Scitote ex illis, praeceptum esse nobis ad redundantiam benignitatis, etiam pro inimicis Deum orare, et persecutoribus nostris bona precari. Qui magis inimici et persecutores Christianorum, quam de quorum majestate convenimur in crimen? Sed etiam nominatim et manifeste *Orate,* inquit, *pro regibus, et pro principibus et potestatibus, ut omnia tranquilla sint vobis* (1 Tim. ii. 2). Cum enim concutitur imperium, concussis etiam ceteris membris ejus, utique et nos, licet extranei a turbis aestimemur, in aliquo loco casus invenimur.

De Monogamia, c. 11. Sciamus plane non sic esse in Graeco authentico quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem. [4]*Si autem dormierit vir ejus* quasi de futuro sonet ac per hoc videatur ad eam pertinere quae jam in fide virum amiserit.

Adv. Praxeam, c. 15. Si hunc articulum quaestionibus Scripturae veteris non expediam, de Novo Testamento sumam confirmationem nostrae interpretationis; ne quodcumque in Filium reputo, in Patrem proinde defendas. Ecce enim et in Evangeliis et in Apostolis visibilem et invisibilem Deum deprehendo, sub manifesta et personali distinctione conditionis utriusque.

6. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Strom. VII. (p. 836). *Σφᾶς γὰρ αὐτοὺς αἰχμαλωτίζειν, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἀναιρεῖν, τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυ-*

[4] See 1 Cor. vii. 39. The Greek is ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς.
[1] The figures refer to *Potter's* edition.

μίας φθειρόμενον, ἀποκτιννύντας, καὶ τὸν καινὸν ἀνιστάντας ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου, τῆς παλαιᾶς διαστροφῆς, τό τε εὐαγγέλιον, ὅ τε ἀπόστολος κελεύουσι.

Strom. VII. (p. 890). Καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσαν, φασί τινες παρθένον εὑρεθῆναι. Τοιαῦται δ' ἡμῖν αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί, τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀποτίκτουσαι, καὶ μένουσαι παρθένοι μετὰ τῆς ἐπικρύψεως τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας μυστηρίων.

Strom. VII. (p. 890). Ἔχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας τὸν Κύριον, διά τε τῶν προφητῶν, διὰ δὲ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων, πολυτρόπως καὶ πολυμερῶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος ἡγούμενον τῆς γνώσεως. Τὴν ἀρχὴν δ' εἴ τις ἑτέρου δεῖσθαι ὑπολάβοι, οὐκέτ' ἂν ὄντως ἀρχὴ φυλαχθείη. Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ πιστὸς τῇ κυριακῇ γραφῇ τε καὶ φωνῇ ἀξιόπιστος εἰκότως ἂν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν ἐνεργουμένῃ.

Strom. VII. (p. 891). Εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μόνον ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν τὸ δόξαν, ἀλλὰ πιστώσασθαι δεῖ τὸ λεχθέν, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον· ἣ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγυωτέρα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις οὖσα τυγχάνει· καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν πιστοί.

7. Origen.

Hom. on Gen. XIII. 2. p. 95. [1]Hoc ergo modo fodit puteos Isaac, quos foderant pueri patris sui. Puer patris sui erat Moyses, qui foderat puteum legis. Pueri patris sui erant David et Salomon et prophetae et si qui alii sunt, qui libros scripserant Veteris Testamenti, quos terrena et sordida repleverat intelligentia Judaeorum. Quam cum vellet purgare Isaac et ostendere, quia quaecunque lex et prophetae dixerunt, de ipso dixerunt, rixati sunt cum eo Philistini. Sed discedit ab eis. Non enim potest esse cum eis, qui in puteis nolunt aquam habere, sed terram. Et dicit eis: *ecce relinquetur vobis domus vestra deserta* (Mat. xxiii. 38). Fodit ergo Isaac et novos puteos, imo pueri Isaac fodiunt. Pueri sunt

[1] As this passage stands, Origen apparently implies that Paul was the author of Hebrews, and he adds James and Jude to the list given as his by Eus. H. E. VI. 25 (see before, page 9). If *omnes* be in the nom. (omnes N. T. puteos fodiunt), there may be no reference to Hebrews.

Isaac, Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Joannes. Pueri ejus sunt Petrus, Jacobus et Judas: puer ejus est et apostolus Paulus, qui omnes Novi Testamenti puteos fodiunt. Sed et pro his altercantur illi qui terrena sapiunt, nec nova condi patiuntur, nec vetera purgari. Evangelicis puteis contradicunt, apostolicis adversantur. Et quoniam in omnibus contradicunt, in omnibus litigant, dicitur ad eos: *Quoniam indignos vos fecistis gratia Dei, ex hoc jam ad gentes ibimus* (Acts xiii. 46).

Hom. on Book of Joshua, VII. 2. p. 412. [2] Veniens vero Dominus noster Jesus Christus, cujus ille prior filius Nave designabat adventum, mittit sacerdotes apostolos suos portantes tubas ductiles, praedicationis magnificam coelestemque doctrinam. Sacerdotali tuba primus in Evangelio suo Matthaeus increpuit, Marcus quoque, Lucas et Joannes, suis singulis tubis sacerdotalibus cecinerunt. Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis. Jacobus quoque et Judas. Addit nihilominus adhuc et Joannes tuba canere per epistolas suas et Apocalypsim et Lucas Apostolorum gesta describens. Novissime autem ille veniens, qui dixit: *puto autem nos Deus novissimos apostolos ostendit* (1 Cor. iv. 9) et in quatuordecim epistolarum suarum fulminans tubis, muros Jericho et omnes idololatriae machinas et philosophorum dogmata usque ad fundamenta dejecit.

8. Lactantius.

(Institut. IV. c. 20.)

Verum scriptura omnis in duo Testamenta divisa est. Illud quod adventum Domini passionemque Christi antecepit, *i.e.,* Lex et Prophetae, Vetus dicitur. Ea vero, quae post resurrectionem ejus scripta sunt, *Novum Testamentum* nominantur. Judaei Veteri utuntur, nos Novo. Sed tamen diversa non sunt, quia Novum Veteris adimpletio est, et in utroque idem testator est Christus.

[2] This passage bears the marks of being a translation, and a literal one. Rufinus the translator is not always to be trusted. Lardner throws doubt on both this passage and the preceding one, because they may have been altered by the translator or by some one after him. Rufinus makes a special claim for his translation of this part of Origen: "Illa, quae in Jesu Nave scripsimus, simpliciter expressimus ut invenimus et non multo cum labore transtulimus."

IV.

THE GOSPELS.[1]

1. Papias.[1]

Eus. H. E. III. 36. *Διέπρεπέ γε μὴν κατὰ τούτους ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμιλητὴς Πολύκαρπος, τῆς κατὰ Σμύρναν ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τῶν αὐτοπτῶν καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος. Καθ' ὃν ἐγνωρίζετο Παπίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεραπόλει παροικίας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος.*

Eus. Chronic. ad Olymp. 220. *Ἰωάννην τὸν θεολόγον καὶ ἀπόστολον Εἰρηναῖος καὶ ἄλλοι ἱστοροῦσι παραμεῖναι τῷ βίῳ ἕως τῶν χρόνων Τραϊανοῦ· μεθ' ὃν Παπίας Ἱεραπολίτης καὶ Πολύκαρπος Σμύρνης ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουσταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐγνωρίζοντο.*

Hieron. ad Theodoram, 75. 3. Refert Irenaeus . . . Papiae auditoris evangelistae Ioannis discipulus.

Iren. V. 33. 3. Praedicta itaque benedictio ad tempora regni sine contradictione pertinet, quando regnabunt justi surgentes a mortuis: quando et creatura renovata et liberata multitudinem fructificabit universae escae, ex rore caeli et ex fertilitate terrae: quemadmodum presbyteri meminerunt, qui Ioannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus et dicebat.

"Venient dies in quibus vineae nascentur, singulae decem millia palmitum habentes et in uno palmite dena millia brachiorum, et in uno vero palmite dena millia flagellorum, et in unoquoque flagello dena millia botruum, et in unoquoque botro dena millia acinorum, et unumquodque acinum expressum dabit viginti quin-

[1] There might perhaps be printed here some fragments of a work ascribed to Polycarp, called *Responsiones*, first published by Feuardentius, from a Catena by Victor of Capua (sixth century). They are found in Feuardentius's Notes on Irenaeus, Haer. III. 3 (vol. II. p. 862, Stieren's Ed.). He says they were lately found by him in an old MS written in very old characters. They point out the different ways in which the four Evangelists begin their Gospels, &c. But they are not accepted by scholars as genuine: even if they were Victor's Catena they are not believed to be Polycarp's work. It is not thought worth while to print them.

[1] In the following extracts the principal references to Papias are given. At the outset are three testifying to his age and date; then comes Irenaeus's Extract from his work; next are the notable passages from Eusebius founding on Irenaeus, followed by Jerome on the same subject. Some extracts from later writers complete the series.

que metretas vini. Et cum eorum apprehenderit aliquis sanctorum botrum, alius clamabit: Botrus ego melior sum, me sume, per me Dominum benedic. Similiter et granum tritici decem millia spicarum generaturum et unamquamque spicam habituram decem millia granorum et unumquodque granum quinque bilibres similae clarae mundae: et reliqua autem poma et semina et herbam secundum congruentiam iis consequentem: et omnia animalia iis cibis utentia quae a terra accipiuntur, pacifica et consentanea invicem fieri, subjecta hominibus cum omni subjectione."

Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ βιβλίων· ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῷ πέντε βιβλία συντεταγμένα. Et adiecit dicens:

"Haec autem credibilia sunt credentibus. Et Iuda" inquit "proditore non credente et interrogante: quomodo ergo tales geniturae a Domino perficientur? dixisse Dominum: 'Videbunt qui venient in illa'."—

Eus. H. E. III. 40.[1] *Τοῦ δὲ Παπία συγγράμματα πέντε τὸν ἀριθμὸν φέρεται, ἃ καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις. Τούτων καὶ Εἰρηναῖος ὡς μόνων αὐτῷ γραφέντων μνημονεύει, ὧδέ πως λέγων·*

Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ βιβλίων. Ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῷ πέντε βιβλία συντεταγμένα.

Καὶ ὁ μὲν Εἰρηναῖος ταῦτα. Αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Παπίας κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων ἀκροατὴν μὲν καὶ αὐτόπτην οὐδαμῶς ἑαυτὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμφαίνει, παρειληφέναι δὲ τὰ τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων διδάσκει, δι' ὧν φησὶ λέξεων·

Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα, συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἑρμηνείαις, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τἀληθῆ διδάσκουσιν, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένοις τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ

[1] See Introduction (Papias) for discussion of this passage.

παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἤ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης.[2]

Ἔνθα καὶ παραστῆσαι ἄξιον δὶς καταριθμοῦντι αὐτῷ τὸ Ἰωάννου ὄνομα, ὧν τὸν μὲν πρότερον Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰακώβῳ καὶ Ματθαίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλέγει, σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν, τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἰωάννην διαστείλας τὸν λόγον ἐν ἑτέροις παρὰ τὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀριθμὸν κατατάσσει, προτάξας αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀριστίωνα, σαφῶς τε αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει. Ὡς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ τῶν δύο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμωνυμίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι εἰρηκότων, δύο δ' ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι. Οἷς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν· εἰκὸς γὰρ οὖν τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μή τις θέλοι τὸν πρῶτον, τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομένην Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου ἑωρακέναι. Καὶ ὁ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Παπίας τοὺς μέν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρειληφέναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτόν φησι γενέσθαι. Ὀνομαστὶ γοῦν πολλάκις αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμμασιν τίθησιν αὐτῶν καὶ παραδόσεις. Καὶ ταῦτα δ' ἡμῖν οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἄχρηστον εἰρήσθω. Ἄξιον δὲ ταῖς ἀποδοθείσαις τοῦ Παπία φωναῖς προσάψαι λέξεις ἑτέρας αὐτοῦ, δι' ὧν παράδοξά τινα ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλα, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα. Τὸ μὲν

[2] While Eusebius says that Papias acquired his information from those who were intimate with the Elders, the grounds on which he bases his opinion, and which he frankly states in the text, do not warrant his contradicting Irenaeus as he does. While Papias undoubtedly endeavoured to learn as much as possible from the friends of the Elders, his first sentence seems to claim for himself that he learned and recorded (see Introduction) what came to him direct from these Elders. In this passage he uses the word "Elder" for those who were Apostles —for Peter and Thomas, as well as for the more ambiguous Philip and James. When he calls John an Elder as well as Aristion, he does not enable us to decide on the question as to there being two Johns, one an Apostle, and one an Elder only. But the Ephesian traditions which Eusebius records are probably conclusive as to there having been two notable Elders of that name in Ephesus. It is, however, an unwarrantable inference that is drawn from this probability, when critics say that Irenaeus and others mistook Polycarp in what he said of his old leader, John, and that he really meant the Elder, while they supposed he meant the Apostle, the son of Zebedee.

οὖν κατὰ τὴν Ἱεράπολιν Φίλιππον τὸν ἀπόστολον ἅμα ταῖς θυγατράσι διατρῖψαι, διὰ τῶν πρόσθεν δεδήλωται. Ὡς δὲ κατὰ [3]τὸν αὐτὸν ὁ Παπίας γενόμενος διήγησιν παρειληφέναι θαυμασίαν ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Φιλίππου θυγατέρων μνημονεύει, τὰ νῦν σημειωτέον. Νεκροῦ γὰρ ἀνάστασιν κατ' αὐτὸν γεγονυῖαν ἱστορεῖ, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἕτερον παράδοξον περὶ Ἰοῦστον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Βαρσαββᾶν γεγονὸς, ὡς δηλητήριον φάρμακον ἐμπιόντος καὶ μηδὲν ἀηδὲς διὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου χάριν ὑπομείναντος. Τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Ἰοῦστον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀνάληψιν τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀποστόλους μετὰ Ματθία στῆσαί τε καὶ ἐπεύξασθαι ἀντὶ τοῦ προδότου Ἰούδα ἐπὶ τὸν κλῆρον τῆς ἀναπληρώσεως τοῦ αὐτῶν ἀριθμοῦ, ἣ τῶν Πράξεων ὧδέ πως ἱστορεῖ γραφή·[4]

Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσὴφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν, ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος, καὶ Ματθίαν· καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπαν.

Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὡσὰν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου εἰς αὐτὸν ἥκοντα παρέθετο, ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, καί τινα ἄλλα μυστικώτερα. Ἐν οἷς καὶ χιλιάδα τινα φησὶν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης. Ἃ καὶ ἡγοῦμαι τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παρεκδεξάμενον διηγήσεις ὑπολαβεῖν, τὰ ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρημένα μὴ συνεωρακότα. Σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν, ὡσὰν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων τεκμηράμενον εἰπεῖν, φαίνεται· πλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε, τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τἀνδρὸς προβεβλημένοις· ὥσπερ οὖν Εἰρηναίῳ, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος τὰ ὅμοια φρονῶν ἀναπέφηνεν.[5] Καὶ ἄλλας δὲ τῇ ἰδίᾳ γραφῇ παραδίδωσιν Ἀριστίωνος τοῦ πρόσθεν δεδηλωμένου τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου παραδόσεις, ἐφ' ἃς τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς ἀναπέμψαντες ἀναγκαίως νῦν προσθήσομεν ταῖς προεκτεθείσαις αὐτοῦ φωναῖς παράδοσιν, ἣν περὶ Μάρκου τοῦ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον γεγραφότος ἐκτέθειται διὰ τούτων·

Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ

[3] Or τοὺς αὐτούς.

[4] The quotation from the Acts of the Apostles is probably made by Eusebius himself, not by Papias.

[5] On the further tradition of the "Elders" preserved by Irenaeus, see under 'Irenaeus.'

ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἕνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.[6] Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτα εἴρηται·

Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραίδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.[7]

Κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως· Ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει. Καὶ ταῦτα δ' ἡμῖν ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τοῖς ἐκτεθεῖσιν ἐπιτετηρήσθω.

Hieronym. de vir. ill. 18. Papias, Joannis auditor, Hierapolitanus in Asia Episcopus, quinque tantum scripsit volumina, quae praenotavit "Explanatio Sermonum Domini." In quibus quum se in praefatione asserat "non varias opiniones sequi, sed apostolos habere auctores" ait: "Considerabam quid Andreas, quid Petrus dixissent, quid Philippus, quid Thomas, quid Jacobus, quid Joannes, quid Matthaeus, vel alius quilibet discipulorum Domini; quid etiam Aristion et senior Joannes, discipuli Domini, loquebantur. Non enim tantum mihi libri ad legendum prosunt, quantum viva vox, usque hodie in suis auctoribus personans." Ex quo apparet in ipso catalogo nominum, alium esse Joannem, qui inter apostolos ponitur, et alium seniorem Joannem, quem post Aristionem enumerat. Hoc autem diximus propter superiorem opinionem, quam

[6] See Introduction. Papias seems merely to say that no rigid order was followed by Mark. It is not improbable that he was defending Mark against a charge brought against his authority on that account. See further traditions about Mark under the head "Mark."

[7] Λόγια, not necessarily "Discourses," as has of late been often alleged. Yet Jerome translates the title "Explanatio Sermonum Domini." The word λόγια seems to be equivalent in early usage to "Holy Scriptures," whether the contents be sayings or narratives. See Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 2 Clem. 13 (and Introduction on 2 Clem.). Papias does not say that in his time there was no approved Greek version of Matthew's Gospel. It may be fairly argued that his words mean that the time for haphazard translations was past. It is Eusebius, not Papias, who refers to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews."

a plerisque retulimus traditam, duas posteriores epistolas Joannis non apostoli esse, sed presbyteri. Hic dicitur mille annorum Judaicam edidisse *δευτέρωσιν*, quem secuti sunt Irenaeus et Apollinarius et caeteri, qui post resurrectionem aiunt in carne cum sanctis Dominum regnaturum. Tertullianus quoque in libro de spe fidelium et Victorinus Petabionensis et Lactantius hac opinione ducuntur. [Opp. ed. Vallarsius T. II. p. 859.]

From Catenae. *Ἀπολιναρίου.*[1] *Οὐκ ἀπέθανε τῇ ἀγχόνῃ Ἰούδας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεβίω καθαιρεθεὶς πρὸ τοῦ ἀποπνιγῆναι. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσιν αἱ τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πράξεις, ὅτι πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτο δὲ σαφέστερον ἱστορεῖ Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μαθητὴς λέγων οὕτως ἐν τῷ δ᾽ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων·*

Μέγα δὲ ἀσεβείας ὑπόδειγμα ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ περιεπάτησεν ὁ Ἰούδας πρησθεὶς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τὴν σάρκα, ὥστε μηδὲ ὁπόθεν ἅμαξα ῥᾳδίως διέρχεται ἐκεῖνον δύνασθαι διελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτὸν μόνον τὸν τῆς κεφαλῆς ὄγκον αὐτοῦ. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ βλέφαρα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ φασὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξοιδῆσαι, ὡς αὐτὸν μὲν καθόλου τὸ φῶς μὴ βλέπειν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ αὐτοῦ μηδὲ ὑπὸ ἰατροῦ [διὰ] διόπτρας ὀφθῆναι δύνασθαι· τοσοῦτον βάθος εἶχεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξωθεν ἐπιφανείας· τὸ δὲ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ πάσης μὲν ἀσχημοσύνης ἀηδέστερον καὶ μεῖζον φαίνεσθαι, φέρεσθαι δὲ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος. Συρρέοντας ἰχῶράς τε καὶ σκώληκας εἰς ὕβριν δι᾽ αὐτῶν μόνων τῶν ἀναγκαίων. Μετὰ πολλὰς δὲ βασάνους καὶ τιμωρίας ἐν ἰδίῳ, φασὶ, χωρίῳ τελευτήσαντος, ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδμῆς ἔρημον καὶ ἀοίκητον τὸ χωρίον μέχρι τῆς νῦν γενέσθαι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον δύνασθαί τινα ἐκεῖνον τὸν τόπον παρελθεῖν, ἐὰν μὴ τὰς ῥῖνας ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπιφράξῃ· τοσαύτη διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔκρυσις ἐχώρησεν.

Hieronym. ad Lucinium, Ep. 71 (28) *c.* 5. Porro Josephi libros et sanctorum Papiae et Polycarpi volumina, falsus ad te rumor pertulit a me esse translata; quia nec otii mei nec virium est, tantas res eadem in alteram linguam exprimere venustate.

[1] Doubtful whether Apollinaris of Hierapolis (A.D. 180), or of Laodicea (A.D. 390). The text is from Gebhardt and Harnack, Pat. Apost. I. 187, whose note enumerates the sources from which Hilgenfeld and others have constructed it. The extracts which follow, by way of Catena, of some of the principal testimonies to Papias, are according to G. & H.'s text. Their complete Catena "Papiae Fragmenta cum testimoniis Veterum Scriptorum" may be consulted.

Andreas Caesariensis in Apoc. c. 34. *serm.* 12. *Παπίας δὲ οὕτως ἐπὶ λέξεως· "Ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν, δηλαδὴ τῶν πάλαι θείων ἀγγέλων, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως ἔδωκεν ἄρχειν καὶ καλῶς ἄρχειν παρηγγύησε." Καὶ ἑξῆς φησίν· "Εἰς οὐδὲν δέον συνέβη τελευτῆσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν."* [Edit. Morel. Opp. St. Chrysost. p. 52.]

Anast. Sinaita. Λαβόντες τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἐκ Παπίου τοῦ πάνυ (παναγίου?) τοῦ Ἱεραπολίτου, τοῦ ἐν (σύν?) τῷ ἐπιστηθίῳ φοιτήσαντος, καὶ Κλήμεντος, Πανταίνου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἱερέως καὶ Ἀμμωνίου σοφωτάτου, τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ πρώτων συνῳδων ἐξηγητῶν, εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἑξαήμερον νοησάντων. [Contempl. anagog. in hexaëm. lib. I. B. PP. Par. 1589. T. I. p. 183.]

Veteres ergo ecclesiarum interpretes, Philo, inquam, philosophus et tempore aequalis apostolis, et celebris Papias Hierapolitanus Joannis evangelistae discipulus . . . et eorum asseclae spiritualiter sunt contemplati de Christi ecclesia ea quae scripta sunt de paradiso. [Lib. VII. p. 269.]

Chronic. pasch. ad Olymp. 235[b]. *Σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ δὲ Πολυκάρπῳ, καὶ ἄλλοι τ' ἀπὸ Φιλαδελφείας μαρτυροῦσιν ἐν Σμύρνῃ· καὶ ἐν Περγάμῳ δὲ ἕτεροι, ἐν οἷς ἦν καὶ Παπίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, ὧν καὶ ἔγγραφα φέρονται τὰ μαρτύρια.* [Ed. Dindorf. Vol. I. p. 481.]

Photius Biblioth. . . . οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Παπίαν τὸν Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον καὶ μάρτυρα, οὐδὲ Εἰρηναῖον τὸν ὅσιον ἐπίσκοπον Λουγδούνων (scil. *ἀποδέχεται Στέφανος*), *ἐν οἷς λέγουσιν αἰσθητῶν τινῶν βρωμάτων ἀπόλαυσιν εἶναι τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν.* [Ed. Bekker 1824, p. 291.]

2. Justin Martyr.[1]

General References to "Memoirs."

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *D.* (Memoirs written by Apostles and their companions.) *Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ*

[1] Here follow some general references to the written documents on which Justin Martyr claims to have founded his statements. They are usually called ἀπομνημονεύματα, sometimes εὐαγγέλιον. The passages in Justin more closely resembling particular passages in the Gospels will be found under the respective headings of the Gospels in a subsequent part of this work. And further on will be found a full citation and analysis of the principal passages containing

φημὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, ὅτι ἱδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο, αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος· Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατὸν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο. (See Luke i. 3 and Luke xxii. 44; Mat. xxvi. 39.)

Apol. I. c. 66. *p.* 98 *B.* (Memoirs called Gospels, and regarded as authoritative.) Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι. (Luke xxii. 19; Mat. xxvi. 28.)

Apol. I. c. 67. *p.* 98 *D.*[2] (Memoirs read in church.) Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ.

Dial. c. 10. *p.* 227 *C.* (Trypho knew and read the Gospel.) Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ [3] παραγγέλματα θαυμαστὰ οὕτως καὶ μεγάλα ἐπίσταμαι εἶναι, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνειν μηδένα δύνασθαι φυλάξαι αὐτά· ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμέλησεν ἐντυχεῖν αὐτοῖς.

Dial. c. 100. *p.* 326 *D.* (Citation from Matthew as from τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.) Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών· πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός· καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.[4] (Mat. xi. 27.)

matter not in the Canonical Books. For convenience, the subject of each of the following quotations is given as a heading.

[2] Justin is here describing a common custom, so that we are to understand that the Memoirs were usually read in Christian congregations along with the Old Testament prophets on Sunday.

[3] In this and the following passage the Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) means the Gospel generally—the Gospel Record. Origen quotes Celsus as using it in the same sense. See Orig. cont. Cels. II. 27, and compare Iren. III. 1. 1: γραφὴ εὐαγγελίου (see below, p. 67).

[4] Justin has the same quotation (simply as words of Jesus) twice in Apol. I. 63. In every case he has the clauses in the same order, inverting St. Matthew. In the Apol. he has ἔγνω. Matthew has παρεδόθη, ἐπιγινώσκει, and βούληται . . .

Apol. I. c. 33. *p.* 75 *B.* (Memoirs contain full accounts of Jesus Christ.) [4]*Καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν παρθένον κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ἄγγελος Θεοῦ, εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτὴν εἰπών· Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν· οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν.* (compare Luke i. 31; Mat. i. 20, 21.)

Dial. c. 104. *p.* 332 *B.* (Justin quotes from Memoirs the incidents of the crucifixion.) *Ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται γενόμενον.*

Dial. c. 105. *p.* 332 *C.* (Memoirs (John?) were Justin's authorities.) *Μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος, καὶ ὕστερον ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γενόμενος, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων ἐμάθομεν, προεδήλωσα κ.τ.λ.* (John i. 18.)

Dial. c. 105. *p.* 333 *B.* (Justin studied the Memoirs.) *Καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ εἶπε· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου· ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἔμαθον.* (Luke xxiii. 46.)

Dial. c. 106. *p.* 333 *C.* (The Memoirs condensed.) *Ὅτε ἐσταυρώθη καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτῶν διάγων ὕμνησε τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων δηλοῦται γεγενημένον.* (Luke xxiv. 25, 26; Mat. xxvi. 30.)

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 315 *D.* (Apostolic writings quoted for part of a narrative.) *Καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν, ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ· καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοὺ ὕδατος ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.*[5] (Mat. iii. 16.)

Dial. c. 106. *p.* 333 *D.* (St. Mark's Gospel apparently quoted as Peter's.) *Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν*

ἀποκαλύψαι. The passage is quoted in various ways by early writers. See Iren. I. 20. 3.

[5] On the Apocryphal addition to this passage see on Mat. iii. 13.

αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένον. Καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφοὺς, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας, μετωνομακέναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργὲς, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς κ.τ.λ.[6] (Mark iii. 16, 17.)

PASSAGES IN WHICH JUSTIN EXPRESSLY CLAIMS TO CITE THE MEMOIRS.

Apol. I. c. 66. *p.* 98 *B.* [1] *Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου· Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.* [Quoted also in previous section.] (Luke xxii. 19; Mat. xxvi. 28.)

Dial. c. 49. *p.* 269 *A.* [2] *Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς εἰρήκει ἐπὶ γῆς τότε τοῖς λέγουσι πρὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἠλίαν δεῖν ἐλθεῖν· Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἠλίας ἤδη ἦλθε, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. Καὶ γέγραπ-*

[6] If αὐτοῦ refer to Christ, it is a solitary case of Justin making ἀπομν. govern the Genitive of the subject. The passage is now usually understood to describe Mark's Gospel as "Peter's Memoirs." In Mark alone of our Gospels is the incident recorded. Another reference to this is Dial. c. 100. p. 327 B (see below, "Matthew").

[1] See above. There can be no doubt that Justin does not here correctly quote any one of our Canonical authorities. It is possible that he intended to give (as he certainly does give) an account substantially corresponding to that of the Memoirs, "not merely quotations of words, but concise narratives" (Westcott, Canon, p. 116, third edition). But it is more probable that he intended to give the very words and failed. In those days (as any minister's experience will testify in our own days) the words of institution when given from memory were seldom quoted with perfect accuracy from any one source. Justin was too familiar with the words to think of turning to the Gospel MS for them; and yet his very familiarity was not in favour of verbal accuracy. There is no need to suppose (though there is no reason why we should not admit it if necessary) that Justin's own words are found in some one written authority. Hence it is a fallacy to say "Justin is giving an account of the most solemn sacrament of his religion. Here if ever we might reasonably expect accuracy and care" (Supernatural Religion, I p. 390, second edition). See Luke xxii. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, for words most nearly Justin's. Compare Mat. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22.

[2] This quotation (from Memoirs?) is verbally exact so far as regards the last part (Mat. xvii. 13) introduced by γέγραπται. The earlier part has ἐλεύσεται for ἔρχεται; and ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ for ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, both being such changes as Justin is in the habit of making, that the Greek may take a less peculiar form than in the Gospels. The omission of ἐν before αὐτῷ is now confirmed by the best MSS. This is also the reading of Mark ix. 13. Justin has the future ἐλεύσεσθαι before in the same chapter. See also p. 268 C.

ται, ὅτι Τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. (Mat. xvii. 11-13.)

Dial. c. 100. *p.* 326 *D.* [3] *Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών· Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.* (Mat. xi. 27; Luke x. 22.)

Dial. c. 101. *p.* 328 *B.* [4] *Οἱ γὰρ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν ἐσταυρωμένον καὶ κεφαλὰς ἕκαστος ἐκίνουν καὶ τὰ χείλη διέστρεφον καὶ τοῖς μυξωτῆρσιν ἐν ἀλλήλοις διερινοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰρωνευόμενοι ταῦτα ἃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται· Υἱὸν Θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε, καταβὰς περιπατείτω· σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός.* (Mat. xxvii. 39, 40, 43; Luke xxiii. 35.)

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *B.* [5] *Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ διάβολος ἅμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῷ λεχθείσης· Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε· ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ· Προσκύνησόν μοι· καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστόν· Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ· Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.* (Mat. iv. 9, 10; Luke iv. 7, 8.)

[3] See note (4) in last section on this passage.

[4] See also Apol. I. c. 38. Justin is arguing from the fulfilment of Psalm xxii., where it is said that enemies pierced the sufferer's hands and feet, and stared upon him &c., and his words are an undeniable amplification of the canonical account. It is not unreasonable to suppose that of those last deeds done at Jerusalem there were many accounts; and that Justin in these two passages consciously or unconsciously departs from the Memoirs as we have them. But his source we do not know. In the Apol. the words are, Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν λέγοντες· Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. (Ps. xxii. 7, 8.) Ἅτινα πάντα ὅτι γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χείλη καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλὰς λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν.

[5] A comparison of this narrative with the narratives of Matthew and Luke shows various divergences of small moment. Thus ὀπίσω μου is inserted (as in Cod. D), though contrary to the best MSS, and the Aorist προσκύνησον stands instead of ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς, and the words γέγραπται γάρ are omitted. This is only like Justin's usual inaccurate mode of quotation. On the ground of the inaccuracies, it has been argued that Justin had another MS authority than our Gospels before him here. But it so happens that Justin again quotes the same passage (Dial. c. 125. p. 354 D) saying, ὡς προεῖπον, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, and then goes on to speak of προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν, giving as Christ's final answer γέγραπται· Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. Here he omits the ὀπίσω μου and inserts γέγραπται, a significant commentary on the futility of arguing as though Justin were minutely accurate, or even strictly consistent with himself, in his quotations.

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *D.* [6] *Καὶ τὸ Ὡσεὶ ὕδωρ ἐξεχύθη καὶ διεσκορπίσθη πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ μου, ἐγενήθη ἡ καρδία μου ὡσεὶ κηρὸς τηκόμενος ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου, ὅπερ γέγονεν αὐτῷ ἐκείνης τῆς νυκτὸς, ὅτε ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν συλλαβεῖν αὐτὸν, προαγγελία ἦν. Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, ὅτι ἱδρὼς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο, αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος· Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο.* (Mat. xxvi. 39; comp. Luke xxii. 42.)

Dial. c. 105. *p.* 333 *B.* [7] *Καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ εἶπε· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου· ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἔμαθον.* (Luke xxiii. 46.)

Dial. c. 106. *p.* 333 *B.* [8] *Ταῦτα εἰρηκέναι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι γέγραπται· Ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.* (Mat. v. 20.)

Dial. c. 107. *p.* 334 *B.* [9] *Καὶ ὅτι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔμελλεν ἀναστήσεσθαι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν συζητοῦντες αὐτῷ ἔλεγον, ὅτι Δεῖξον ἡμῖν σημεῖον. Καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς· Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτοῖς εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.* (Mat. xii. 39.)

[6] See first passage, p. 59. The quotation from the Memoirs agrees with our Gospel of Luke (Luke xxii. 44) for the sweat, save that αἵματος is omitted (θρόμβος itself means a gout or clot of blood). The prayer of Jesus resembles Matthew xxvi. 39 more closely than Luke. In Dial. c. 99. p. 326 B, Justin quotes the prayer again, but not in the same words, ηὔχετο λέγων· πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ. If therefore Justin quoted correctly from his author in the one case, he did not in the other. This difficulty cannot be overcome by those who suppose Justin to have followed his Gospel accurately. The rest of the prayer was, according to Justin (Dial. c. 99), Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο εὐχόμενος λέγει· Μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σὺ θέλεις, which agrees with neither Matthew nor Luke, but is more like Matthew. Everything points to Justin's combining the narratives as suited himself or as his memory enabled him. No argument can be founded on the supposition that he was careful or successful in reproducing his sources.

[7] *Verbatim* from Luke xxiii. 46.

[8] This quotation is exact, ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη being the correct reading.

[9] This is Mat. xii. 39 verbatim, save that Justin reads αὐτοῖς for αὐτῇ, and that he does not add τοῦ προφήτου after Ἰωνᾶ.

3. Letter to Diognetus.[1]

C. 11. *Εἶτα φόβος νόμου ᾄδεται καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκεται καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίστις ἵδρυται καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσεται καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ.*

4. The Evangelists at Trajan's time.

Eus. H. E. III. 37. *Καὶ γὰρ δὴ πλεῖστοι τῶν τότε μαθητῶν σφοδροτέρῳ φιλοσοφίας ἔρωτι πρὸς τοῦ Θείου λόγου τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναρπαζόμενοι, τὴν σωτήριον πρότερον ἀπεπλήρουν παρακέλευσιν, ἐνδεέσι νέμοντες τὰς οὐσίας, εἶτα δὲ ἀποδημίας στελλόμενοι ἔργον ἐπετέλουν εὐαγγελιστῶν, τοῖς ἔτι πάμπαν ἀνηκόοις τοῦ τῆς πίστεως λόγου κηρύττειν τὸν Χριστὸν φιλοτιμούμενοι, καὶ τὴν τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων παραδιδόναι γραφήν.*[1]

[1] The 'Epistle to Diognetus' was at one time ascribed to Justin Martyr on the strength of a title apparently ascribing it to him in a MS of probably the thirteenth or fourteenth century. It follows some works in Justin's name, but not now regarded as his. The Ep. to Diognetus makes ample use of Paul, and if it were Justin's would be very valuable. The external objections to the Justinian authorship are: (1) It is not quoted or alluded to—so far as is known—by any Christian writer of antiquity. (2) The MS itself (which was burned in the fires of Strassburg during the recent Franco-German war) is of very dubious authority. (It is not absolutely inconceivable that Henry Stephens, its editor, was also its author. See Donaldson, Christian Literature, II. 142.) Its value is disputed on the following internal grounds: (1) Its style is not Justin's. (2) Its use of Scripture is not like Justin's. (3) Its mode of dealing with the religions of Judea, Greece, and Rome is not Justin's. To (1) and (2) plausible replies may be easily made; but (3) seems to me insurmountable. Justin's respectful, though faithful, handling of the great faiths with which Christianity contended is very unlike the contemptuous tone of the writer of the Epistle. While the reference in the text is given for the sake of completeness, it cannot be founded upon. The date may be from the end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century; or it may be the fiction of a later time. It follows Justin here, because of its association with his works. The text is from Gebhardt and Harnack (1875). The eleventh and twelfth chapters are supposed by some to be by a later hand than the ten which precede. See Cotterill's Peregrinus Proteus, p. 131.

[1] There can be no doubt from the context that Eusebius is describing the first age after the Apostles. The words with which he closes the paragraph and introduces Ignatius and Clement of Rome are interesting to the student of ecclesiastical offices, as well as useful for our present purpose. He says: Ἀδυνάτου δὲ ὄντος ἡμῖν ἅπαντας ἐξ ὀνόματος ἀπαριθμεῖσθαι, ὅσοι ποτὲ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίας γεγόνασι ποιμένες ἢ καὶ εὐαγγελισταί, τούτων εἰκότως ἐξ ὀνόματος γραφῆ μόνων τὴν μνήμην κατεθέμεθα, ὧν ἔτι καὶ νῦν εἰς ἡμᾶς δι' ὑπομνημάτων τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διδασκαλίας ἡ παράδοσις φέρεται. He says that very many marvellous miracles were wrought (εἰσέτι τότε) by those men. There is an interesting passage in 2 Clement, c. 2, where after quoting Is. liv. 1 &c. the writer says: Ἐπεὶ ἔρημος ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν, νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύσαντες

5. Quadratus.[1]

Eus. H. E. IV. 3. *Τοῦ δὲ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα ἀεὶ παρῆν. Ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν· οἱ θεραπευθέντες, οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν, οἳ οὐκ ὤφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι, καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ παρόντες· οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος, ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἱκανὸν, ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο.*

6. Irenaeus.

B. III. 1. Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus, quam per eos per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum. Nec enim fas est dicere, quoniam ante praedicaverunt quam perfectam haberent agnitionem; sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes emendatores se esse apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis et induti sunt supervenientis Spiritus Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt, et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem; exierunt in fines terrae, ea quae a Deo nobis bona sunt evangelizantes, et coelestem pacem hominibus annuntiantes, qui quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei.

πλείονες ἐγενόμεθα τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν Θεόν. By οἱ δοκοῦντες he no doubt meant the Jews; and by λαός he seems from the context to have meant the Christian community.

[1] Quadratus presented his Apology to Hadrian, and it was known to Eusebius, who praises it in high terms. It was a vindication of the purity of the life of Christians. From his statement that some of those on whom the Saviour's miracles had been wrought survived to his time, it is possible that he is the same Quadratus of whom the historian speaks elsewhere as having the gift of prophecy at the time when the daughters of Philip were similarly endowed (H. E. III. 37). It is not certain that he was the Athenian Bishop mentioned in the letter of Dionysius of Corinth (Eus. H. E. IV. 23). Nor indeed is anything more known of him with certainty than what Eusebius says in introducing the extract in our text. —He adds that Aristides also presented an Apology along with Quadratus (παραπλησίως) which was extant in the possession of very many. At the same date (the time of Hadrian) Agrippa Castor wrote against Basilides (Eus. H. E. IV. 7). He was the first who wrote against heresy. The writings of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Melito are quoted in our text. With those mentioned in this note and the doubtful Hermias they make up the 'Apologists.' See Donaldson, 'Hist. of Christian Literature and Doctrine,' II. 4.

[1]*Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Καὶ Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσὼν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.*[2]

B. III. 11. 7. Et haec quidem sunt principia Evangelii, unum Deum fabricatorem hujus universitatis, eum qui et per prophetas sit annunciatus, et qui per Moysem legis dispositionem fecerit, patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi annunciantia, et praeter hunc alterum Deum nescientia, neque alterum Patrem. Tanta est autem circa Evangelia haec firmitas, ut et ipsi haeretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam. Ebionaei etenim eo Evangelio, quod est secundum Matthaeum,[3] solo utentes, ex illo ipso convincuntur, non recte praesumentes de Domino. Marcion autem id quod est secundum Lucam circumcidens, ex his quae adhuc servantur penes eum, blasphemus in solum existentem Deum ostenditur. Qui autem Jesum separant a Christo, et impassibilem perseverasse Christum, passum vero Jesum dicunt, id quod secundum Marcum est praeferentes Evangelium, cum amore veritatis legentes illud, corrigi possunt. Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum, ex ipso detegentur nihil recte dicentes, quemadmodum ostendimus in primo libro. Cum ergo hi

[1] From Eus. H. E. V. 8.

[2] See further Eus. H. E. II. 15; III. 24; VI. 14. The traditions regarding the origin of the Gospels vary. Regarding Matthew's Gospel and its relation to the Gospel of the Hebrews, see Introduction, 'Gospel of Hebrews.' As regards Mark, whether ἔξοδον means death or departure from the city, Irenaeus is in conflict with Eus. H. E. VI. 14, because Eusebius distinctly says Peter was made aware of Mark's Gospel. See also II. 16. Ἔκδοσιν for ἔξοδον is probably an attempt to get over the difficulty. As regards Mark's relation to Peter, and Luke's to Paul, traditionary testimony agrees, that in each case the Evangelist reduced to writing the substance of his Master's teaching. As regards John, see Introduction, and the passages quoted below; and compare Clement's account (below, p. 74).

[3] See Introduction: 'Gospel of Hebrews.'

qui contradicunt, nobis testimonium perhibeant, et utantur his, firma et vera est nostra de illis ostensio.

B. III. 11. 8. Neque autem plura numero quam haec sunt, neque rursus pauciora capit esse Evangelia.[4]

Ἐπειδὴ . . . τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κόσμου, ἐν ᾧ ἐσμέν· εἰσὶ, καὶ τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, στύλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς· εἰκότως τέσσαρας ἔχειν αὐτὴν στύλους, παντα-χόθεν πνέοντας τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ ἀναζωπυροῦντας τοὺς ἀνθρώ-πους. Ἐξ ὧν φανερὸν, ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων τεχνίτης Λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον. Καθὼς ὁ Δαβὶδ αἰτούμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν, φησίν· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ, ἐπιφάνηθι. Καὶ γὰρ τὰ Χερουβὶμ τετραπρόσωπα· καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν εἰ-κόνες τῆς πραγματείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ζῶον, φησὶν, ὅμοιον λέοντι· τὸ ἔμπρακτον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ βασιλικὸν χαρακτηρίζον· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ὅμοιον μόσχῳ, τὴν ἱερουρ-γικὴν καὶ ἱερατικὴν τάξιν ἐμφαῖνον· τὸ δὲ τρίτον ἔχον πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου, τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν φανερώτατα δια-γράφον· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὅμοιον ἀετῷ πετομένῳ, τὴν τοῦ πνεύμα-τος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐφιπταμένου δόσιν σαφηνίζον. Καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια οὖν τούτοις σύμφωνα,[5] ἐν οἷς ἐγκαθέζεται Χριστός. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ Ἰωάννην,[6] τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικήν αὐτοῦ. . . . καὶ ἔνδοξον γενεὰν διηγεῖται, λέγον· ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος καὶ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο· καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν . . . . Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, ἅτε ἱερατικοῦ χαρακτῆρος ὑπάρχον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἱερέως θυμιῶντος τῷ Θεῷ ἤρξατο. Ἤδη γὰρ ὁ σι-τευτὸς ἡτοιμάζετο μόσχος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνευρέσεως τοῦ νεωτέρου παι-δὸς μέλλων θύεσθαι. Ματθαῖος δὲ τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ γέννησιν κηρύττει, λέγων· Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ

[4] See before, note on Justin, Dial. c. 227. Ign. Philad. c. 5 has apparently εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολοι, as the divisions of the N .T. The 'Gospel' and the 'Apostles' became well-known divisions after Clem. Alex. The Greek of the following notable passage was found by Grabe in the Quaestiones of Anastasius Sinaita.

[5] Or σύμμορφα.

[6] The Latin version is: Aliud enim illam, quae est a Patre, principalem et efficabilem et gloriosam generationem ejus enarrat dicens sic, &c. The words καὶ ἔμπρακτον seem to have dropped out.

Δαβὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Καὶ· τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν. Ἀνθρωπόμορφον οὖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο. . . . . Μάρκος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιόντος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο, λέγων· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ· τὴν πτερωτικὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου δεικνύων· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ σύντομον καὶ παρατρέχουσαν τὴν καταγγελίαν πεποίηται· προφητικὸς γὰρ ὁ χαρακτὴρ οὗτος. Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς μὲν πρὸ Μωϋσέως πατριάρχαις, κατὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν καὶ ἔνδοξον ὡμίλει· τοῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ἱερατικὴν . . . . τάξιν ἀπένειμε. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς πᾶσαν ἐξέπεμψε τὴν γῆν, σκεπάζων ἡμᾶς ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ πτέρυξιν. Ὁποία οὖν ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοιαύτη καὶ τῶν ζώων ἡ μορφή· καὶ ὁποία ἡ τῶν ζώων μορφὴ, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Τετράμορφα γὰρ τὰ ζῶα, τετράμορφον καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ Κυρίου. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τέσσαρες ἐδόθησαν καθολικαὶ διαθῆκαι τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι· μία μὲν τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τοῦ Νῶε, ἐπὶ τοῦ τόξου· δευτέρα δὲ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τοῦ σημείου τῆς περιτομῆς· τρίτη δὲ ἡ νομοθεσία ἐπὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως· τετάρτη δὲ ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

§ 9. *Τούτων δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων, μάταιοι πάντες καὶ ἀμαθεῖς, προσέτι δὲ καὶ τολμηροὶ οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἰδέαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ εἴτε πλείονα, εἴτε ἐλάττονα τῶν εἰρημένων παρεισφέροντες εὐαγγελίων πρόσωπα· οἱ μὲν, ἵνα πλείονα δόξωσι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξευρηκέναι· οἱ δὲ, ἵνα τὰς οἰκονομίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀθετήσωσιν.*

Etenim Marcion totum rejiciens Evangelium, immo vere se ipsum abscindens ab Evangelio, partem gloriatur se habere Evangelii.[7] Alii vero ut donum Spiritus frustrentur,[8] quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum Patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Joannis Evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus

[7] Another reading is "*pariter gloriatur se habere Evangelium.*" This would be an allusion to the previous description of the Gospel as four-formed.

[8] Some have supposed the Montanists to be here described. But the Alogi, who rejected the Johannine portion of the four-formed Gospel, are more probably meant. See under John's Gospel. The Montanists claimed the gift of prophecy; but they did not reject the Fourth Gospel.

promisit; sed simul et Evangelium, et propheticum repellunt spiritum. Infelices vere, qui pseudoprophetae quidem esse volunt, prophetiae vero gratiam repellunt ab ecclesia: similia patientes his, qui propter eos qui in hypocrisi veniunt, etiam a fratrum communicatione se abstinent.[9] Datur autem intelligi, quod hujusmodi neque apostolum Paulum recipiant. In ea enim Epistola, quae est ad Corinthios, de propheticis charismatibus diligenter locutus est, et scit viros et mulieres in ecclesia prophetantes. Per haec igitur omnia peccantes in Spiritum Dei, in irremissibile incidunt peccatum. Hi vero, qui sunt a Valentino, iterum exsistentes extra omnem timorem, suas conscriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur, quam sint ipsa Evangelia. Siquidem in tantum processerunt audaciae, uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, Veritatis Evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangeliis, ut nec evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia. Si enim, quod ab eis profertur, Veritatis est Evangelium, dissimile est autem hoc illis, quae ab apostolis nobis tradita sunt; qui volunt, possunt discere, quemadmodum ex ipsis scripturis ostenditur, jam non esse id quod ab apostolis traditum est Veritatis Evangelium. Quoniam autem sola illa vera et firma, et non capit neque plura, praeterquam praedicta sunt, neque pauciora esse Evangelia, per tot et tanta ostendimus. Etenim cum omnia composita et apta Deus fecerit, oportebat et speciem Evangelii bene compositam, et bene compaginatam esse. Examinata igitur sententia eorum qui nobis tradiderunt evangelium, ex ipsis principiis ipsorum, veniamus et ad reliquos apostolos, et perquiramus sententiam eorum de Deo: post deinde, ipsos Domini sermones audiamus.

[9] The well-known tenet of the Montanists forbidding the restoration of the lapsed to Christian privileges is probably here alluded to. The reference in the first part of the sentence is obscure. Those "infelices" appear to be the sect of whom he speaks immediately before; but it is not easy to find from other sources any sect to which the description fully applies. On the whole, we may suppose that he compares the Alogi (or some such sect) in their rejection of prophecy with the Montanists in their seclusion of themselves from their fellow-Christians. The whole passage is difficult, as it runs in the old Latin.

7. The Presbyters,[1]

WHOSE TESTIMONY IRENAEUS REPORTS UPON.

Iren. IV. 32. 1. Hujusmodi quoque de duobus Testamentis *senior apostolorum discipulus* disputabat, ab uno quidem et eodem Deo utraque ostendens. Nec enim esse alterum Deum praeter eum qui fecit et plasmavit nos, nec firmitatem habere sermonem eorum qui dicunt aut per angelos aut per aliam quamlibet virtutem aut ab alio Deo factum esse hunc mundum qui est secundum nos. . . Si autem credat quis unum Deum, et qui verbo omnia fecit quemadmodum et Moses ait: *Dixit Deus fiat lux et facta est lux* (Gen. i. 3); et in Evangelio legimus: *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil,* &c.

B. II. 22. 5. [2]Quia autem XXX annorum aetas prima indolis est juvenis, et extenditur usque ad XL annorum, omnibus quilibet confitebitur; a XL autem et L anno declinat jam in aetatem seniorem, quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut evangelium *καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννῃ τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδωκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. Παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων.* Quidam autem eorum non solum Joannem sed et alios apostolos viderunt, et haec eadem ab ipsis audierunt, et testantur de hujusmodi relatione. Quibus majus oportet credi? Utrumne his talibus, an Ptolemaeo, qui apostolos nunquam vidit, vestigium autem apostoli ne in somniis quidem assecutus est?

[1] Eus. H. E. V. 8 says of Irenaeus: Καὶ Ἀπομνημονευμάτων [Ὑπομνημάτων] δὲ ἀποστολικοῦ τινὸς πρεσβυτέρου, οὗ τοὔνομα σιωπῇ παρέδωκε μνημονεύει· ἐξηγήσεις τε αὐτοῦ θείων γραφῶν παρατίθεται. Eusebius had not a clue to the name of this Presbyter (he seems to have thought there was but one, or is it but one whose writings were accessible?); and modern conjecture is vain. It can scarcely have been Polycarp or Papias. Sometimes Irenaeus calls his authority ὁ κρείσσων ἡμῶν (I. Pref. 2, I. 13. 3 &c.), *superior* (III. 17. 4). Sometimes he defines him. Thus, Quemadmodum audivi a quodam *Presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant et ab iis qui didicerant* (IV. 27. 1 &c.). Again he quotes from *senior apostolorum discipulus* (IV. 32. 1). In our second extract (II. 22. 5) he connects his authorities with John. Elsewhere he calls his authority ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτης καὶ κήρυξ τῆς ἀληθείας and ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτης.

[2] Irenaeus is opposing the idea that our Lord's ministry lasted only for one year. He argues that when our Lord was baptized He was not of full age to be a teacher, as Luke iii. 23 does not say He had completed 30 years. He seems to found upon John viii. 57. The Greek is from Eus. H. E. III. 23.

B. V. 36. 1, 2. [3]*Ὡς οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγουσι, τότε καὶ οἱ μὲν καταξιωθέντες τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς, ἐκεῖσε χωρήσουσιν, οἱ δὲ τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου τρυφῆς ἀπολαύσουσιν, οἱ δὲ [τὴν ἁγίαν γῆν καὶ] τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως καθέξουσιν [σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ αὐτὴν ἀγαθοῖς, ἐπιχορηγουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ] πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁραθήσεται, καθὼς ἄξιοι ἔσονται οἱ ὁρῶντες αὐτόν. Εἶναι δὲ τὴν διαστολὴν ταύτην τῆς οἰκήσεως τῶν τὰ ἑκατὸν καρποφορούντων* (Mat. xiii. 8), *καὶ τῶν τὰ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τῶν τὰ τριάκοντα· ὧν οἱ μὲν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀναληφθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ διατρίψουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν κατοικήσουσιν. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μονὰς εἶναι πολλάς* (John xiv. 2)*· τὰ πάντα γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν ἁρμόζουσαν οἴκησιν παρέχει.* Quemadmodum verbum ejus ait, omnibus divisum esse a Patre secundum quod quis est dignus aut erit. Et hoc est triclinium in quo recumbent ii qui epulantur vocati ad nuptias. Hanc esse adordinationem et dispositionem eorum qui salvantur, dicunt *presbyteri apostolorum discipuli,* et per hujusmodi gradus perficere, et per Spiritum quidem ad Filium, per Filium autem ascendere ad Patrem; Filio deinceps cedente Patri opus suum, quemadmodum et ab apostolo dictum est (1 Cor. xv. 25): *Quoniam oportet regnare eum quoadusque ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus ejus. Novissima inimica destruetur mors.* In temporibus enim regni justus homo super terram exsistens, obliviscetur mori jam (1 Cor. xv. 27). *Quando autem dixerit,* inquit: *omnia subjecta sunt scilicet absque eo qui subjecit omnia. Quum autem ei fuerint subdita omnia tunc ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui sibi subjecit omnia, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus.*

8. Tatian.[1]

Eus. H. E. IV. 29. *Ὁ μέντοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Ταταινὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐ-*

[3] From Iren. V. 36. 1 &c.; the Greek from Anastasius, Quaest. 74 in Script. Sac. The words in brackets are not found in the Latin of Irenaeus.

[1] *Tatian,* a native of Assyria, a rhetorician by profession, disgusted with heathenism, was converted to Christianity. He is said to have been a hearer of Justin (Iren. I. 28. 1 quoted by Eus. H. E. IV. 29). He appears to have published some heretical notions soon after A.D. 170. He held peculiar views about aeons; declared marriage to be corruption; and denied that Adam could be saved. He objected to the O. T., probably because of its recognizing poly-

αγγελίων συνθεὶς τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν· ὃ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται. Τοῦ δ' ἀποστόλου φασὶ τολμῆσαί τινας αὐτὸν μεταφράσαι φωνὰς, ὡς ἐπιδιορθούμενον αὐτῶν τὴν τῆς φράσεως σύνταξιν.

Theodoret,[2] *Haer. Fab.* I. 20. *Οὗτος καὶ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τάς τε γενεαλογίας περικόψας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγενημένον τὸν Κύριον δείκνυσιν. Ἐχρήσαντο δὲ τούτῳ οὐ μόνον οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου συμμορίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἑπόμενοι δόγμασι, τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακουργίαν οὐκ ἐγνωκότες, ἀλλ' ἁπλούστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι. Εὗρον δὲ κἀγὼ πλείους ἢ διακοσίας βίβλους τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ἐκκλησίαις τετιμημένας, καὶ πάσας συναγαγὼν ἀπεθέμην καὶ τὰ τῶν τεττάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον εὐαγγέλια.*

9. Theophilus.[1]

Ad Autol. III. pp. 124, 125. *Ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἧς ὁ νόμος εἴρηκεν, ἀκόλουθα εὑρίσκεται καὶ τὰ τῶν προφητῶν*

gamy. His view of the O. T. made him like a Gnostic; but he seems to have been a follower of no School. His only extant work is his Oration to the Greeks, written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (quoted below, see 'Gospel of John'). His most famous work Διὰ τεσσάρων is lost. It is to it Eusebius refers in the text. Eusebius also quotes as a report (λόγος ἔχει) that Tatian was the founder (ἀρχηγόν) of the Encratites, who denounced marriage; but his quotation from Irenaeus only bears that the sect of the Encratites derived from Tatian their recently adopted opinion that Adam was beyond salvation. Eusebius did not know what kind of thing the Διὰ τεσσάρων was. It seems to have been a Harmony or blending of the four Gospels. Theodoret's account (in next extract) is probable enough; and the omission of the genealogies might be part of the work which Tatian thought it necessary to do in order to compile a concise and consistent narrative from the four Gospels. Epiphanius says, "The Gospel by the four (τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων) is said to have been made by him, which some call the Gospel according to the Hebrews." Victor of Capua (sixth century) says it was called Dia Pente, but this assertion has no weight. Some think that he meant διὰ πάντων, others that he mistook the book. (See Donaldson, Christian Literature, II. 26, and the whole of his exhaustive discussion.) See below, under Matthew's Gospel, a disputed passage.

[2] *Theodoret* was Bishop of Cyrus in Syria from about A.D. 420, and died A.D. 457. He was a voluminous author, writing a History of the Church, Commentaries on Scripture, &c. His objection to Tatian's book is founded on the absence of the genealogies; and he seems to have known no other fault,—τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα being vague enough to mean anything or nothing.

[1] *Theophilus*, Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 180-193; the sixth from the Apostles, says Eusebius (H. E. IV. 20, 24). He is said to have written a Harmony. His chief work—to Autolycus—in three Books, survives. Eusebius calls

καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ἔχειν, διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἐνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι.

Hieron. prooem. in Mat. T. IV. p. 3. Primum enim difficile est omnes legere qui in Evangelia scripserunt. Deinde multo difficilius, adhibito judicio, quae optima sunt, excerpere. Legisse me fateor ante annos plurimos in Matthaeum Origenis vigintiquinque volumina, et totidem ejus homilias, commaticumque interpretationis genus: et *Theophili Antiochenae urbis Episcopi Commentarios. . . .*

Hieron. epist. ad Algas. T. IV. p. 197. Theophilus, Antiochenae ecclesiae septimus post Petrum apostolum episcopus, qui *quatuor evangelistarum* in unum opus dicta compingens, ingenii sui nobis monimenta reliquit, haec super hac parabola in suis *commentariis* locutus est.

Hieron. de ill. vir. c. 25. Legi sub ejus nomine *in Evangelium et in Proverbia Solomonis Commentarios,* qui mihi cum superiorum voluminum elegantia et phrasi non videntur congruere.

10. Clement of Alexandria.

(See before, p. 67, and notes.)

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. *Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις,*[1] *μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών,*[2] *τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολὰς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν. Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστο-*

it elementary (στοιχειώδη). It is a discourse composed at different times in three parts to show the superiority of Christianity to heathenism. He founds largely upon the O. T. He is the first to quote the Gospel of John by name (see below, John's Gospel), but he refers to several books of the N. T., and explicitly quotes 1 Timothy (see below). He wrote a book against Marcion which is lost. Some 'Commentaries on the Gospels' in Latin bearing his name are extant, but are not allowed by scholars to be his. Eusebius says that in writing against the heresy of Hermogenes he used testimonies from the Apocalypse. He cites Paul's Epistle as Θεῖος λόγος. The passage in our text puts the New Testament and the Old on the same level; and the same word πνευματόφοροι is used in the citation from John, so that αἱ ἁγίαι γραφαί probably includes John in that case. The way in which he quotes Matthew and John, his work against Marcion, and his Commentaries or his Harmony, may serve to show the acceptance of the Gospels in his time.

[1] διηγήσεις: variously translated "*explications*," "*accounts*," "*narratives.*"

[2] ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί: see before, page 10, for explanation of Eusebius's meaning.

λήν. [For the rest of this reference see under 'Hebrews.'] Αὖθις δ' ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὁ Κλήμης βιβλίοις περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων τέθειται, τοῦτον ἔχουσαν τὸν τρόπον. Προγεγράφθαι ἔλεγον τῶν Εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον,[3] ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. Τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα· ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι, τὸν μέντοι Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον συνιδόντα, ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. Τοσαῦτα ὁ Κλήμης.

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 553. Διὰ τοῦτό τοι ὁ Κασσιανὸς φησὶ, πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, ἔφη ὁ Κύριος, ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἄῤῥεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄῤῥεν, οὔτε θῆλυ. Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους.[4]

11. Tertullian.

(See Adv. Marcion. IV. 1, before p. 49.)

Adv. Marcion. IV. 2. Habes nunc ad Antitheses expeditam a nobis responsionem. Transeo nunc ad Evangelii, sane non Judaici, sed Pontici,[1] interim adulterati demonstrationem, prae-

[3] Compare what is said by Irenaeus (p. 67). The discrepancy may be removed by supposing that Peter did not know at first of the request made to Mark, that he neither approved nor disapproved of the writing of the Gospel, but that when it was written he was pleased with it, and sanctioned (tacitly or expressly) its circulation. But is it necessary to explain a discrepancy like this which marks the variations of a tradition?

[4] The way in which Clement here quotes the Gospel of the Egyptians is significant. To say (as the author of 'Supernatural Religion' says, I. 422) that "Clement of Alexandria quotes the Gospel of the Hebrews as an authority with quite the same respect as the other Gospels" is incorrect, as may be seen from the distinct place assigned by Clement to the four canonical Gospels in the text. (See below, 'Gospel of Hebrews.')

[1] Marcion was a native of Sinope (Pontus), hence the phrase 'Pontic Gospel.' He was in communion with the Church of Rome in the time of Eleutherus (according

structuram ordinem quem aggredimur. Constituimus in primis, evangelicum Instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum; si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis, et post apostolos. Quoniam praedicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriae studio, si non adsistat illi auctoritas magistrorum, immo Christi, quae magistros apostolos fecit. Denique, nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthaeus insinuant; ex apostolicis, Lucas et Marcus instaurant, iisdem regulis exorsi, quantum ad unicum Deum attinet Creatorem, et Christum ejus, natum ex Virgine, supplementum Legis et Prophetarum. Viderit enim si narrationum dispositio variavit, dummodo de capite fidei conveniat, de quo cum Marcione non convenit. Contra Marcion, Evangelio, scilicet suo, nullum adscribit auctorem, quasi non licuerit illi titulum quoque affingere, cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere. Et possem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contendens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam praeferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli, et professione debita auctoris. Sed per omnia congredi malumus, nec dissimulamus quod ex nostro intellegi potest. Nam ex iis commentatoribus quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem caederet.[2] Porro Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolicus: non ma-

to Tertullian), and is said to have been expelled from the Church because of his crimes. His activity in Rome began about A.D. 135-142, probably about A.D. 141. Justin (A.D. 139-148 (?), see Introduction) writes of him as well-known, and followed by many in every nation. His main idea was the usual Gnostic one of antagonism between the Old and New Testaments; and he held that the Jewish God was not He whom Jesus preached. He published a Canon: one Gospel, 'The Gospel of the Lord' = a mutilated Luke, and 10 Epp. of Paul called ἀπόστολος. His Epp. were Gal., Cor. (2), Rom., Thess. (2), Eph., Coloss., Philem., Philipp., and some passages from that "to the Laodiceans." His version of the Gospel of Luke is published by Hahn (Thilo, Cod. Apoc.). Rejecting the opening chapters, he began with the Lord's appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum. The life and death of Jesus are retained with such changes as he thought necessary,—*e.g.*, in Luke xxiv. 25 he omits the reference to the prophets. His great work was called Antitheses—*i.e.*, Antagonism between the Old Testament and the New.

[2] It is now generally agreed by almost all critics of every school that Marcion had Luke's Gospel before him and mutilated it. The argument in 'Supernatural Religion' in favour of Marcion's originality is well answered by Sanday, 'Gospels in the Second Century.' The Fathers are unanimous in stating that Marcion altered Luke; Epiphanius and Tertullian quote largely from Marcion's Gospel, and their quotations correspond. The difference between our Gospel and Marcion's is mainly that the latter omits passages, although in some cases he preserves a different reading from that in the ordinary text. The testimony of Irenaeus is clear, and

gister, sed discipulus; utique magistro minor; certe tanto posterior, quanto posterioris apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio: ut, etsi sub ipsius Pauli nomine Evangelium Marcion intulisset, non sufficeret ad fidem singularitas Instrumenti, destituta patrocinio antecessorum; exigeretur enim id quoque Evangelium quod Paulus invenit, cui fidem dedidit, cui mox suum congruere gestiit. Siquidem (Gal. ii. 1) propterea *Hierosolymam ascendit ad cognoscendos apostolos,* et consultandos, *ne forte in vacuum cucurrisset,* i.e., ne non secundum illos credidisset, et non secundum illos evangelizaret. Denique, ut cum auctoribus contulit et convenit de regula fidei, dexteras miscuere, et exinde officia praedicandi distinxerunt, ut illi in Judaeos, Paulus in Judaeos et in nationes. Igitur si ipse illuminator Lucae, auctoritatem antecessorum et fidei et praedicationi suae optavit, quanto magis eam Evangelio Lucae expostulem, quae evangelio magistri ejus fuit necessaria? Aliud est, si penes Marcionem a discipulatu Lucae coepit religionis Christianae sacramentum. Caeterum, si et retro decucurrit, habuit utique authenticam paraturam, per quam ad Lucam usque pervenit, cujus testimonio assistente, Lucas quoque possit admitti.

C. 3. Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis (Gal. ii), ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseudapostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum eorum Evangeliorum, quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum; ut scilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, suo conferat. Porro, etsi reprehensus est Petrus et Joannes et Jacobus, qui existimabantur columnae, manifesta causa est.[3] Personarum enim respectu videbantur variare convictum. Et tamen, cum ipse Paulus *omnibus omnia fieret, ut omnes lucraretur* (1 Cor. ix. 19), potuit et

made repeatedly, and testifies to the fact of the mutilation of St. Paul's Epistles and of St. Luke's Gospel (see before in the quotations from Iren. I. 27. 2, &c., and afterwards under 'Marcion'). Justin, writing about A.D. 147, says that Marcion's doctrines were widespread. The difference in N. T. readings between Marcion's copy of Luke and that known to Tertullian throws the Gospel back to a considerably anterior date; as the readings show that Marcion's copy was the result of repeated transcription.

[3] Marcion was a resolute enemy of Judaism, and he therefore rested on Galatians, although he cut out even from it the references to Abraham in c. iii.

Petro hoc in consilio fuisse, aliquid aliter agendi, quam docebat. Proinde si et pseudapostoli irrepserant, horum quoque qualitas edita est, circumcisionem vindicantium et Judaicos fastos. Ideo non de praedicatione, sed de conversatione, a Paulo denotabantur; aeque denotaturo, si quid de Deo creatore, aut Christo ejus errassent. Igitur distinguenda erunt singula. Si apostolos praevarications et simulationis suspectos Marcion haberi queritur usque ad Evangelii[4] depravationem, Christum jam accusat, accusando quos Christus elegit. Si vero apostoli quidem integrum evangelium contulerunt, de sola convictus inaequalitate reprehensi, pseudapostoli autem veritatem eorum interpolaverunt, et inde sunt nostra Digesta; quod erit germanum illud apostolorum Instrumentum, quod adulteros passum est? Quod Paulum illuminavit, et ab eo Lucam? Aut si tam funditus deletum est, ut cataclysmo quodam, ita inundatione falsariorum obliteratum; jam ergo nec Marcion habet verum. Aut si ipsum erit verum, id est apostolorum, quod Marcion habet solus; et quomodo nostro consonat, quod non apostolorum, sed Lucae refertur? Aut si non statim Lucae deputandum est, quo Marcion utitur; quia nostro consonat, scilicet adulterato etiam circa titulum; caeterum apostolorum est; jam ergo et nostrum quod illi consonat, aeque apostolorum est, sed adulteratum de titulo quoque.

C. 4. Funis ergo ducendus est contentionis, pari hinc inde nisu fluctuante. Ego meum dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit, nisi temporis ratio, ei praescribens auctoritatem, quod antiquius reperietur; et ei praejudicans vitiationem, quod posterius revincetur? In quantum enim falsum corruptio est veri, in tantum praecedat necesse est veritas falsum. Prior erit res passione, et materia aemulatione. Alioquin, quam absurdum ut si nostrum antiquius probaverimus, Marcionis vero posterius; et nostrum ante videatur falsum quam habuerit de veritate materiam, et Marcionis ante credatur aemulationem a nostro expertum quam et editum, et postremo id verius existimetur, quod est serius post tot ac tanta jam opera atque documenta Christianae religionis seculo edita, quae edi utique non potuissent sine Evangelii

[4] *Evangelium* here is not used as by St. Paul for the substance of the Gospel, but denotes the written Gospel, as is clear from what follows.

veritate, id est ante Evangelii veritatem. Quod ergo pertinet ad Evangelium interim Lucae, quatenus communio ejus inter nos et Marcionem de veritate disceptat, adeo antiquius Marcione est, quod est secundum nos, ut et ipse illi Marcion aliquando crediderit; quum et pecuniam in primo calore fidei catholicae ecclesiae contulit, projectam mox cum ipso postea quam in haeresim suam a nostra veritate descivit. Quid nunc si negaverint Marcionitae, primam apud nos fidem ejus, adversus epistolam quoque ipsius? Quid si nec epistolam agnoverint? Certe Antitheses non modo fatentur Marcionis, sed et praeferunt. Ex his mihi probatio sufficit. Si enim id Evangelium quod Lucae refertur penes nos (viderimus an et penes Marcionem) ipsum est quod Marcion per Antitheses suas arguit, ut interpolatum a protectoribus Judaïsmi ad concorporationem Legis et Prophetarum, qua etiam Christum inde confingerent, utique non potuisset arguere, nisi quod invenerat. Nemo post futura reprehendit, quae ignorat futura: emendatio culpam non antecedit. Emendator sane evangelii a Tiberianis usque ad Antoniniana tempora eversi, Marcion solus et primus obvenit, expectatus tamdiu a Christo, poenitente jam quod apostolos praemisisse properasset sine praesidio Marcionis; nisi quod humanae temeritatis, non divinae auctoritatis negotium est haeresis, quae sic semper emendat Evangelia, dum vitiat: quum etsi discipulus Marcion, *non* tamen *super magistrum* (Mat. x. 24). Et si apostolus Marcion, *Sive ego,* inquit Paulus (1 Cor. xv. 11), *sive illi, sic praedicamus.* Et si prophetes Marcion: et *spiritus prophetarum prophetis erunt subditi* (1 Cor. xiv. 32). *Non enim eversionis sunt, sed pacis.* Etiam si angelus Marcion, citius (Gal. i. 8) anathema dicendus quam evangelizator, quia aliter evangelizavit. Itaque dum emendat, utrumque confirmat, et nostrum anterius, id emendans quod invenit, et id posterius, quod de nostri emendatione constituens, suum et novum fecit.

C. 5. In summa, si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod et ab initio, *id* ab initio, quod ab apostolis, pariter utique constabit; id esse ab apostolis traditum, quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum. Videamus quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauserint, ad quam regulam Galatae sint recorrecti, quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses, Ephesii; quid

etiam Romani de proximo sonent, quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt. Habemus et Joannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit auctorem. Sic et caeterarum generositas recognoscitur. Dico itaque apud illas, nec solas jam apostolicas, sed apud universas, quae illis de societate sacramenti confoederantur, id Evangelium Lucae ab initio editionis suae stare, quod cum maxime tuemur: Marcionis vero, plerisque nec notum; nullis autem notum, ut non eadem damnatum. Habet plane et illud ecclesias, sed suas, tam posteras quam adulteras, quarum si censum requiras, facilius apostaticum invenias quam apostolicum; Marcione scilicet conditore, vel aliquo de Marcionis examine. Faciunt favos et vespae; faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitae. Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum caeteris quoque patrocinabitur Evangeliis, quae proinde per illas, et secundum illas habemus, Joannis dico et Matthaei, licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus. Nam et Lucae Digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit magistrorum videri, quae discipuli promulgarint. Itaque et de his Marcion flagitandus, quod omissis eis, Lucae potius institerit, quasi non et haec apud ecclesias a primordio fuerint, quemadmodum et Lucae. Atquin haec magis a primordio fuisse credibile est, ut priora, qua apostolica, ut cum ipsis ecclesiis dedicata. Caeterum, quale est, si nihil apostoli ediderunt, ut discipuli potius ediderint, qui nec discipuli existere potuissent sine ulla doctrina magistrorum? Igitur dum constet haec quoque apud ecclesias fuisse, cur non haec quoque Marcion attigit, aut emendanda si adulterata, aut agnoscenda si integra? Nam et competit, ut si qui Evangelium pervertebant eorum magis curarent perversionem, quorum sciebant auctoritatem receptiorem. Ideo et pseudapostoli, quod per falsum apostolos imitarentur. In quantum ergo emendasset quae fuissent emendanda, si fuissent corrupta, in tantum confirmavit non fuisse corrupta, quae non putavit emendanda. Denique emendavit, quod corruptum existimavit. Sed nec hoc merito, quia non fuit corruptum. Si enim apostolica integre decucurrerunt, Lucae autem, quod est secundum nos, adeo congruit regulae eorum, ut cum illis apud ecclesias maneat, jam et Lucae constat integrum decucurrisse

usque ad sacrilegium Marcionis. Denique, ubi manus illi Marcion intulit, tunc diversum et aemulum factum est apostolicis. Igitur dabo consilium discipulis ejus, ut aut illa convertant, licet sero, ad formam sui, quo cum apostolicis convenire videantur (nam et quotidie reformant illud, prout a nobis quotidie revincuntur), aut erubescant de magistro utrobique traducto, cum Evangelii veritatem nunc ex conscientia tramittit; nunc ex impudentia evertit. His fere compendiis utimur, quum de Evangelii fide adversus haereticos expedimur, defendentibus et temporum ordinem posteritati falsariorum praescribentem, et auctoritatem ecclesiarum traditioni apostolorum patrocinantem, quia veritas falsum praecedat necesse est, et ab eis procedat, a quibus tradita est.

C. 6. Sed alium jam hinc inimus gradum, ipsum (ut professi sumus) Evangelium Marcionis provocantes, sic quoque probaturi adulteratum. Certe enim totum, quod elaboravit, etiam Antitheses praestruendo, in hoc cogit, ut *Veteris et Novi Testamenti* diversitatem constituat; proinde Christum suum a creatore separatum, ut Dei alterius, ut alienum Legis et Prophetarum.

12. Origen.

Contra Celsum, Tom. III. p. 473 (Migne, vol. I. p. 969). *Πιστεύομεν δὲ καὶ ταῖς προαιρέσεσι τῶν γραψάντων τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, καταστοχαζόμενοι τῆς εὐλαβείας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ συνειδότος, ἐμφαινομένων τοῖς γράμμασιν, οὐδὲν νόθον καὶ κυβευτικὸν, καὶ πεπλασμένον καὶ πανοῦργον ἐχόντων.*

Homil. in Luc. Tom. III. p. 932 sq.) (Migne, vol. III. p. 1801.)[1] *Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων. Ἐπειδὴ ὑπέρογκον ἦν τὸ ἐπιχείρημα ἄνθρωπον ὄντα Θεοῦ διδασκαλίαν καὶ ῥήματα συγγράφειν, εἰκότως ἀπολογεῖται ἐν*

Sicut olim in populo Judaeorum multi prophetiam pollicebantur, et quidam erant pseudoprophetae e quibus unus fuit Ananias filius Agot; alii vero prophetae; et erat gratia in populo discernendorum spirituum, per quem alii inter prophetas recipiebantur, nonnulli quasi ab exerci-

[1] After his return from Antioch, to which he had been called by Mammaea mother of Alexander Severus, he began his Commentaries on Scripture.

τῷ προοιμίῳ. Ὥσπερ δὲ οὖν τῷ παλαιῷ λαῷ πολλοὶ προφητείαν ἐπηγγέλλοντο, ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν τινὲς ἦσαν ψευδοπροφῆται, τινὲς δὲ ἀληθῶς προφῆται. Καὶ ἦν τῷ λαῷ χάρισμα διακρίσεως πνευμάτων· οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ τὰ Εὐαγγέλια πολλοὶ ἐθέλησαν γράψαι, ἀλλ᾽ οἱ δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται[2] οὐ πάντα ἀνέκριναν, ἀλλὰ τὰ τέσσαρα μόνον ἐπελέξαντο. Τάχα οὖν τὸ ἐπεχείρησαν, λεληθυῖαν ἔχει κατηγορίαν τῶν προπετῶς καὶ χωρὶς χαρίσματος ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων. Ματθαῖος γὰρ οὐκ ἐπεχείρησεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔγραψεν ἐξ ἁγίου κινούμενος πνεύματος. Ὁμοίως καὶ Μάρκος καὶ Ἰωάννης· παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ Λουκᾶς. Τὸ μέντοι ἐπιγεγραμμένον κατ᾽ Αἰγυπτίους Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον Τῶν Δώδεκα Εὐαγγέλιον οἱ συγγράψαντες ἐπεχείρησαν. Φέρεται δὲ τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν Εὐαγγέλιον. Ἤδη δὲ ἐτόλμησε καὶ Βασιλίδης γράψαι κατὰ Βασιλίδην Εὐαγγέλιον. Πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπεχείρησαν καὶ κατὰ Ματθίαν καὶ ἀλλὰ πλείονα· τὰ δὲ τέτταρα μόνα προκρίνει ἡ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία. Οὐχ ἁπλῶς δὲ πεπιστευμένων, ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορημένων τὸ ἀπαράβατον τοῖς λεγομέ-

tatissimis trapezitis (Rom. ii. 16) reprobabantur; ita et nunc in Novo Testamento multi conati sunt scribere Evangelia, sed non omnes recepti. Et ut sciatis, non solum quatuor Evangelia, sed plurima esse conscripta, e quibus haec, quae habemus, electa sunt, et tradita ecclesiis, ex ipso prooemio Lucae, quod ita contexitur, cognoscamus: *Quoniam quidem multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem.* Hoc quod ait, *conati sunt,* latentem habet accusationem eorum qui absque gratia Spiritus Sancti ad scribenda Evangelia prosilierunt. Matthaeus quippe, et Marcus, et Joannes, et Lucas non sunt conati scribere; sed Spiritu Sancto pleni scripserunt Evangelia. Multi igitur conati sunt ordinare narrationem de his rebus quae manifestissime cognitae sunt in nobis. Ecclesia quatuor habet Evangelia, haereses plurima: e quibus quoddam scribitur secundum Aegyptios, aliud juxta Duodecim Apostolos. Ausus fuit et Basilides scribere Evangelium, et suo illud nomine titulare. Multi conati sunt scribere; sed et multi conati sunt ordinare. Quatuor tantum Evangelia sunt probata, e quibus sub persona Domini et Sal-

[2] The well-known saying γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι (Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 354). It is sometimes ascribed to Jesus Christ (Origen), sometimes to Paul (Cyril Alex.).

νοις μαρτυρῶν. Πραγμάτων δὲ εἶπεν, ἀναιρῶν τὴν αἵρεσιν τῶν κατὰ φαντασίαν λεγομένων τὰ διὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος γεγενῆσθαι κατὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν αὐτοῦ. Περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων εἰπῶν τὴν διάθεσιν αὐτοῦ ἐμφαίνει. Πεπληροφόρητο γὰρ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐδίσταζε πότερον οὕτως ἔχει ἢ οὔ. Ὅτι δὲ παρὰ τῶν αὐτοψεὶ θεασαμένων παρέλαβε, σαφῶς ὡμολόγησεν εἰπών· Καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. Διαβεβαιοῦται γὰρ ὅτι ἄνωθεν παρηκολούθησεν οὗ τισι τῶν εἰρημένων ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν.[3]

vatori nostris proferenda sunt dogmata. Scio quoddam Evangelium, quod appellatur secundum Thomam, et juxta Matthiam, et alia plura legimus, ne quid ignorare videremur, propter eos qui se putant aliquid scire, si ista cognoverint. Sed in his omnibus nihil aliud probamus nisi quod ecclesia, id est quatuor tantum Evangelia recipienda. Haec idcirco, quia in principio lectum est: *Multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem de his rebus quae confirmatae sunt in nobis.* Illi tentaverunt atque conati sunt de his rebus scribere, quae in nobis manifestissime sunt compertae. Effectum suum Lucas indicat ex sermone quo ait: *In nobis manifestissime sunt ostensae,* id est πεπληροφορημένων (quod uno verbo Latinus sermo non explicat).

Comment. in Joh. Tom. I. 4 sqq. (Migne, vol. IV. p. 25.) Καὶ γὰρ τολμητέον εἰπεῖν πασῶν τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι ἀπαρχὴν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Ἀπαρχὴν οὖν πράξεων ἐξ οὗ τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπιδεδημήκαμεν[4], τίνα ἄλλην, ἢ τὴν εἰς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἐχρὴν γενονέναι; Χρὴ δὲ ἡμᾶς εἰδέναι οὐ ταὐτὸν εἶναι ἀπαρχὴν καὶ πρωτογέννημα. Μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς πάντας καρποὺς ἀναφέρεται ἡ ἀπαρχὴ, πρὸ δὲ πάντων τὸ πρωτογέννημα.[5] Τῶν τοίνυν φερομένων γρα-

[3] On the Apocryphal Gospels mentioned in this extract, Origen's testimony is interesting. On the Gospel of Basilides see Introduction; on the Gospel of The Twelve see Introduction 'Gospel of the Hebrews.' The Gospel according to the Egyptians is not mentioned elsewhere by Origen.

[4] The Greek is from the "*Schedae Grabii et Combefisii;*" the Latin (which varies considerably) is from Jerome's translation.

[5] Origen distinguishes between the offering of the "first-fruits of thy labours" at the feast of harvest (see Lev. ii. 14) and the further and more formal

φῶν καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐκκλησίαις Θεοῦ πεπιστευμένων εἶναι θείων, οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι τις λέγων πρωτογέννημα μὲν τὸν Μωϋσέως νόμον, ἀπαρχὴν δὲ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς πάντας τῶν προφητῶν καρποὺς, τῶν μέχρι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὁ τέλειος ἐβλάστησε λόγος.

C. 5. Ἐὰν δέ τις ἀνθυποφέρῃ διὰ τὴν ἔννοιαν τῆς ἀναπτύξεως τῶν ἀπαρχῶν φάσκων μετὰ τὰ Εὐαγγέλια τὰς Πράξεις καὶ τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς φέρεσθαι τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο μὴ ἂν ἔτι σώζεσθαι τὸ προαποδεδομένον περὶ ἀπαρχῆς, τὸ ἀπαρχὴν πάσης γραφῆς εἶναι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· λεκτέον ἤτοι νοῦν εἶναι σοφῶν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὠφελημένων ἐν ταῖς φερομέναις Ἐπιστολαῖς, δεομένων ἵνα πιστεύωνται μαρτυριῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς νομικοῖς καὶ προφητικοῖς λόγοις κειμένων ὥστε σοφὰ μὲν καὶ πιστὰ λέγειν καὶ σφόδρα ἐπιτεταγμένα τὰ ἀποστολικὰ, οὐ μὴν παραπλήσια τῷ· Τάδε λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ· καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἐπίστησον εἰ, ἐπὰν λέγει ὁ Παῦλος· Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος ἐμπεριλαμβάνει καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ γράμματα, ἢ οὐ τό· Κἀγὼ λέγω, καὶ οὐχ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ τό· Ἐν πάσαις ἐκκλησίαις διατάσσομαι, καὶ τό· Οἷα ἔπαθον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις καὶ τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσια ἐνίοτε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφέντα καὶ κατ' ἐξουσίαν, οὐ μὴν τὸ εἰλικρινὲς τῶν ἐκ θείας ἐπιπνοίας λόγων· ἢ καὶ τοῦτο παραστατέον ὅτι ἡ Παλαιὰ μὲν οὐκ Εὐαγγέλιον, οὐ δεικνύουσα τὸν ἐρχόμενον, ἀλλὰ προαγγέλλουσα καὶ προκηρύσσουσα· πᾶσα δὲ ἡ Καινὴ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστιν, οὐ μόνον ὁμοίως τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου φάσκουσα· Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποικίλας δοξολογίας περιέχουσα καὶ διδασκαλίας τοῦ δι' ὃν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστιν. . . .

C. 6. Ἐγὼ δὲ οἶμαι, ὅτι καὶ, τεσσάρων ὄντων τῶν Εὐαγγελίων, οἱονεὶ στοιχείων τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐξ ὧν στοιχείων ὁ πᾶς συνέστηκε κόσμος, ἐν Χριστῷ καταλλαγεὶς τῷ Θεῷ, καθά φησιν ὁ Παῦλος· Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, οὗ κόσμου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἦρεν Ἰησοῦς· περὶ γὰρ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ γεγραμμένος· Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀμνὸς

offering at the feast of Pentecost. See Lev. xxiii. and Exod. xxiii. 16. The former, בִּכּוּרִים, πρωτογεννήματα, he finds in the law of Moses; the latter, תְּרוּמוֹת, ἀπαρχή, is the Gospel. Lardner translates literally "first-begotten" and "first-fruits." See Num. xxviii. 26, &c. יוֹם הַבִּכּוּרִים, day of first-fruits, is Pentecost. See Oehler, O. T. Theology, vol. II § 155.

τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀπαρχὴν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων εἶναι τὸ προστεταγμένον ἡμῖν ὑπό σου κατὰ δύναμιν ἐρευνῆσαι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην· τὸν γενεαλογούμενον εἰπών, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγενεαλογήτου ἀρχόμενον· Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ, τοῖς προσδοκῶσι τὸν [τὸ] ἐξ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Δαβὶδ Ἑβραίοις γράφων, Βίβλος, φησὶ, γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαβὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ· καὶ Μάρκος εἰδὼς ὃ γράφει, ἀρχὴν διηγεῖται τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, τάχα εὑρισκόντων ἡμῶν τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν ἀρχῇ Λόγον Θεὸν Λόγον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ Λουκᾶς εἰρηκὼς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν Πράξεων· Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν, ἀλλά γε τηρεῖ τῷ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος ἀναπεσόντι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοὺς μείζονας καὶ τελειοτέρους περὶ Ἰησοῦ λόγους. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐκείνων ἀκρατῶς ἐφανέρωσεν αὐτοῦ τὴν θεότητα, ὡς Ἰωάννης παραστήσας αὐτὸν λέγοντα· Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωή· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει· Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος. τολμητέον τοίνυν εἰπεῖν ἀπαρχὴν μὲν πασῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, τῶν δὲ Εὐαγγελίων ἀπαρχὴν τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην, οὗ τὸν νοῦν οὐδεὶς δύναται λαβεῖν μὴ ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος Ἰησοῦ, μηδὲ λαβὼν ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τὴν Μαρίαν γινομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ μητέρα. . . . Ἔστι δὲ προσαχθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ Παύλου λεγομένων περὶ τοῦ πᾶσαν τὴν Καινὴν εἶναι τὰ Εὐαγγέλια ὅταν που γράφῃ· Κατὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιόν μου· ἐν γράμμασι γὰρ Παύλου οὐκ ἔχομεν βιβλίον Εὐαγγέλιον συνήθως καλούμενον. Ἀλλὰ πᾶν ὃ ἐκήρυσσε καὶ ἔλεγε τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἦν· ἃ καὶ ἐκήρυσσε καὶ ἔλεγε, ταῦτα καὶ ἔγραφε· καὶ ἃ ἔγραφε ἄρα Εὐαγγέλιον ἦν. Εἰ δὲ τὰ Παύλου Εὐαγγέλιον ἦν, ἀκόλουθον λέγειν, ὅτι καὶ τὰ Πέτρου Εὐαγγέλιον ἦν κ.τ.λ.

Comment. in Joh. Tom. V. p. 98 (Migne, vol. IV. p. 193). Ἔτι προσθήσω εἰς τὴν τούτου ἀπόδειξιν ῥητὸν ἀποστολικὸν μὴ νενοημένον ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀθετούντων τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, τὸ γὰρ τὸν ἀπόστολον λέγειν, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ μὴ φάσκειν Εὐαγγέλια, ἐκεῖνοι ἐφιστάντες φασὶν, οὐκ ἂν πλειόνων ὄντων Εὐαγγελίων τὸν ἀπόστολον ἐνικῶς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον εἰρηκέναι· οὐ συνιέντες ὅτι ὡς εἷς ἐστὶν ὃν εὐαγγελίζονται πλείονες, οὕτως ἓν ἐστι τῇ δυνάμει

τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν εὐαγγέλιον ἀναγεγραμμένον· καὶ τὸ ἀληθῶς διὰ τεσσάρων ἓν ἐστι εὐαγγέλιον.

13. Dionysius of Alexandria.[1]

Ep. ad Basilid. (Routh's Rel. Sac. Vol. III. p. 223.)

Ἐπέστειλάς μοι, πιστότατε καὶ λογιώτατε υἱέ μου, πυνθανόμενος καθ' ἣν ὥραν ἀπονηστίζεσθαι δεῖ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα περιλύσει. Τινὰς μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν λέγειν φῄς ὅτι χρὴ τοῦτο ποιεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλεκτοροφωνίαν, τινὰς δὲ, ὅτι ἀφ' ἑσπέρας χρή. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀδελφοὶ, ὥς φασι, περιμένουσι τὸν ἀλέκτορα· περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἔλεγες, ὅτι τάχιον. Ἀκριβῆ δὲ ὅρον ἐπιτιθέναι ζητεῖς, καὶ ὥραν πάνυ μεμετρημένην· ὅπερ καὶ δύσκολον καὶ σφαλερόν ἐστι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καιρὸν χρὴ τῆς ἑορτῆς καὶ τῆς εὐφροσύνης ἐνάρχεσθαι, μέχρις ἐκείνου τὰς ψυχὰς ταῖς νηστείαις ταπεινοῦντας, ὑπὸ πάντων ὁμοίως ὁμολογηθήσεται· κατεσκεύασας δὲ δι' ὧν ἔγραψάς μοι πάνυ ὑγιῶς καὶ τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων ᾐσθημένος ὅτι μηδὲν ἀπηκριβωμένον ἐν αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς ὥρας καθ' ἣν ἀνέστη, φαίνεται. Διαφόρως μὲν γὰρ οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἐλθόντας ἀνέγραψαν κατὰ καιροὺς ἐνηλλαγμένους, καὶ πάντες ἀνεστηκότα ἤδη τὸν Κύριον ἔφασαν εὑρηκέναι· καὶ ὀψὲ σαββάτων, ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖος εἶπε· καὶ πρωΐας ἔτι σκοτίας οὔσης, ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης γράφει· καὶ ὄρθρου βαθέος, ὡς ὁ Λουκᾶς· καὶ λίαν πρωῒ ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, ὡς ὁ Μάρκος. Καὶ πότε μὲν ἀνέστη, σαφῶς οὐδεὶς ἀπεφήνατο· ὅτι δὲ ὀψὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, μέχρις ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων, οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον παραγενόμενοι, οὐκέτι κείμενον αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κατέλαβον, τοῦτο ἀνωμολόγηται. Καὶ μηδὲ διαφωνεῖν, μηδὲ ἐναντιοῦσθαι τοὺς εὐαγγελιστὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπολάβωμεν· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μικρολογία τις εἶναι δόξει περὶ τὸ ζητούμενον· εἰ συμφωνοῦντες πάντες ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὸ τοῦ κόσμου φῶς τὸν Κύριον

[1] Dionysius was first head of the Catechetical School, and afterwards Bishop of the Church, in Alexandria. His Episcopate was about A.D. 247-265. He is famous for his views of the Apocalypse, which see below in our text from Eus. H. E. VII. 27. His argument, drawn from internal considerations as regards style, &c., concludes that the author of the Apocalypse did not write the Fourth Gospel. He was a scholar and a critic, and on that account his testimony to the four Evangelists in the text is all the more valuable. He cites the two Apostles before the two companions of the Apostles.

ἡμῶν ἀνατεταλκέναι περὶ τὴν ὥραν διαφέρονται· ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς εὐγνωμόνως τὰ λεχθέντα καὶ πίστως ἁρμόσαι προθυμήθωμεν.

14. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 24.

Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων.

Φέρε δὲ καὶ τοῦδε τοῦ ἀποστόλου[1] *τὰς ἀναντιῤῥήτους ἐπισημαινώμεθα γραφάς. Καὶ δὴ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν Εὐαγγέλιον ταῖς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν διεγνωσμένον ἐκκλησίαις, πρῶτον ἀνομολογείσθω. Ὅτι γε μὴν εὐλόγως πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐν τετάρτῃ μοίρᾳ τῶν ἄλλων τριῶν κατείλεκται, ταύτῃ ἂν γένοιτο δῆλον. Οἱ θεσπέσιοι καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς θεοπρεπεῖς, φημὶ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, τὸν βίον ἀκριβῶς κεκαθαρμένοι, καὶ ἀρετῇ πάσῃ τὰς ψυχὰς κεκοσμημένοι, τὴν δὲ γλῶτταν ἰδιωτεύοντες, τῇ γε μὴν πρὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος αὐτοῖς δεδωρημένῃ θείᾳ καὶ παραδοξοποιῷ δυνάμει θαρσοῦντες, τὸ μὲν ἐν πειθοῖ καὶ τέχνῃ λόγων τὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου μαθήματα πρεσβεύειν, οὔτε ἤθεσαν οὔτε ἐνεχείρουν, τῇ δὲ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος τοῦ συνεργοῦντος αὐτοῖς ἀποδείξει, καὶ τῇ δι' αὐτῶν συντελουμένῃ θαυματουργῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δυνάμει μόνῃ χρώμενοι, τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὴν γνῶσιν ἐπὶ πάσην κατήγγελον τὴν οἰκουμένην· σπουδῆς τῆς περὶ τὸ λογογραφεῖν μικρὰν ποιούμενοι φροντίδα. Καὶ τοῦτ' ἔπραττον, ἅτε μείζονι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἐξυπηρετούμενοι διακονίᾳ. Ὁ γοῦν Παῦλος πάντων ἐν παρασκευῇ λόγων δυνατώτατος νοήμασί τε ἱκανώτατος γεγονὼς, οὐ πλέον τῶν βραχυτάτων ἐπιστολῶν*[2] *γραφῇ παραδέδωκε, καίτοι γε μυρία καὶ ἀπόῤῥητα λέγειν ἔχων, ἅτε τῶν μέχρις οὐρανοῦ τρίτου θεωρημάτων ἐπιψαύσας, ἐπ' αὐτόν τε τὸν θεοπρεπῆ παρά-*

[1] The previous chapter is occupied with incidents concerning the "disciple whom Jesus loved, the Apostle and Evangelist John;" the chief part being the beautiful story of the young robber whom John reclaimed. It is quoted by Eusebius from Clem. Alex. This chapter (24) contains an account of the Gospels, especially of John's relation to the Synoptists. The chief point of Eusebius's statement is that John (omitting the genealogies) gives an account of earlier incidents in the Lord's public life than the others give. He intimates at the close that John's first Ep. is undisputed; but that on the other two and on the Apocalypse opinions were greatly divided. He also makes it clear that he believed the Church—and especially the Apostles who afterwards became Evangelists—to have begun by oral preaching; writing being the result of subsequent necessities.

[2] This may mean "very few letters," or it may have the same meaning as Origen's ὀλίγους στίχους ἐπέστειλε. See before, page 9, from Eus. H. E. VI. 25.

δεισον ἀναπασθεὶς, καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖσε ῥημάτων ἀῤῥήτων ἀξιωθεὶς ἐπακοῦσαι. Οὐκ ἄπειροι μὲν οὖν ὑπῆρχον τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν φοιτηταὶ, δώδεκα μὲν ἀπόστολοι, ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ μαθηταὶ, ἄλλοι τε ἐπὶ τούτοις μυρίοι. Ὅμως δὲ οὖν ἐξ ἁπασῶν τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου διατριβῶν ὑπομνήματα Ματθαῖος ἡμῖν καὶ Ἰωάννης μόνοι καταλελοίπασιν, οὓς καὶ ἐπάναγκες ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἐλθεῖν κατέχει λόγος. Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἤμελλεν καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν Εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, τούτοις ἀφ' ὧν ἐστέλλετο, διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἀπεπλήρου. Ἤδη δὲ Μάρκου καὶ Λουκᾶ τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς Εὐαγγελίων τὴν ἔκδοσιν πεποιημένων, Ἰωάννην φασὶ, τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἀγράφῳ κεχρημένον κηρύγματι, τέλος καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἐλθεῖν τοιᾶσδε χάριν αἰτίας. Τῶν προαναγραφέντων τριῶν εἰς πάντας ἤδη καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν διαδεδομένων, ἀποδέξασθαι μὲν φασὶν, ἀληθειαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρήσαντα, μόνην δὲ ἄρα λείπεσθαι τῇ γραφῇ τὴν περὶ τῶν ἐν πρώτοις καὶ κατ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πεπραγμένων διήγησιν. Καὶ ἀληθής γε ὁ λόγος. Τοὺς τρεῖς γοῦν εὐαγγελιστὰς συνιδεῖν πάρεστι, μόνα τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ κάθειρξιν ἐφ' ἕνα ἐνιαυτὸν πεπραγμένα τῷ Σωτῆρι συγγεγραφότας, αὐτό τε τοῦτ' ἐπισημηναμένους καταρχὰς τῆς αὐτῶν ἱστορίας. Μετὰ γοῦν τὴν τεσσαρακονταήμερον νηστείαν καὶ τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῇ πειρασμὸν τὸν χρόνον τῆς ἰδίας γραφῆς ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος δηλοῖ λέγων·

Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη, ἀνεχώρησεν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος ὡσαύτως·

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι,

φησὶν,

Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς δὲ πρὶν ἄρξασθαι τῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πράξεων, παραπλησίως ἐπιτηρεῖ φάσκων,

Ὡς ἄρα προσθεὶς Ἡρῴδης οἷς διεπράξατο πονηροῖς κατέκλεισε τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν φυλακῇ.

Παρακληθέντα δὴ οὖν τούτων ἕνεκά φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰω-

ἄννην τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν προτέρων εὐαγγελιστῶν παρασιωπηθέντα χρόνον, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοῦτον πεπραγμένα τῷ Σωτῆρι (ταῦτα δ' ἦν τὰ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ καθειρξεως) τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίῳ παραδοῦναι, αὐτό γε τοῦτ' ἐπισημήνασθαι, τότε μὲν φήσαντα·

Ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐποίησε τῶν παραδόξων ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

τότε δὲ μνημονεύσαντα τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ μεταξὺ τῶν Ἰησοῦ πράξεων, ὡς ἔτι τότε βαπτίζοντος ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλεὶμ, σαφῶς τε τοῦτο δηλοῦν ἐν τῷ λέγειν·

Οὔπω γὰρ ἦν Ἰωάννης βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακήν.

Οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν Ἰωάννης τῇ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίου γραφῇ, τὰ μηδέπω τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἰς φυλακὴν βεβλημένου πρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ πραχθέντα παραδίδωσιν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τρεῖς εὐαγγελισταὶ τὰ μετὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον κάθειρξιν τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ μνημονεύουσιν. Οἷς καὶ ἐπιστήσαντι οὐκέτ' ἂν δόξαιεν διαφωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, τῷ τὸ μὲν κατὰ Ἰωάννην τὰ πρῶτα τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πράξεων περιέχειν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου αὐτῷ γεγενημένην ἱστορίαν· εἰκότως γοῦν τὴν μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενεαλογίαν ἅτε Ματθαίῳ καὶ Λουκᾷ προγραφεῖσαν, ἀποσιωπῆσαι τὴν Ἰωάννην, τῆς δὲ θεολογίας ἀπάρξασθαι ὡσὰν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος οἷα κρείττονι παραπεφυλαγμένης. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς εἰρήσθω. Καὶ τῆς κατὰ Μάρκον δὲ ἡ γενομένη αἰτία ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δεδήλωται. Ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς ἀρχόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν συγγράμματος τὴν αἰτίαν προὔθηκε, δι' ἣν πεποίηται τὴν σύνταξιν· δηλῶν ὡς ἄρα πολλῶν καὶ ἄλλων προπετέστερον ἐπιτετηδευκότων διήγησιν ποιήσασθαι ὧν αὐτὸς πεπληροφόρητο λόγων, ἀναγκαίως ἀπαλλάττων ἡμᾶς τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀμφηρίστου ὑπολήψεως τὸν ἀσφαλῆ λόγον ὧν αὐτὸς ἱκανῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν κατειλήφει, ἐκ τῆς ἅμα Παύλῳ συνουσίας τε καὶ διατριβῆς καὶ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμιλίας ὠφελημένος, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου παρέδωκεν Εὐαγγελίου. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἡμεῖς περὶ τούτων· οἰκειότερον δὲ κατὰ καιρὸν διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων παραθέσεως τὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρημένα πειρασόμεθα δηλῶσαι.[3] *Τῶν δὲ Ἰωάννου συγγραμμάτων πρὸς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ ἡ προτέρα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν παρά τε τοῖς νῦν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς*

[3] One of his many unfulfilled intentions.

ἀρχαίοις ἀναμφίλεκτος ὡμολόγηται, ἀντιλέγονται δὲ αἱ λοιπαὶ δύο. Τῆς δὲ Ἀποκαλύψεως εἰς ἑκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλκεται ἡ δόξα. Ὁμοίως γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μαρτυρίας ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ τὴν ἐπίκρισιν δέξεται καὶ αὐτή.[4]

Demonstratio evangel. III. 5. Ματθαῖος ἀπόστολος τὸν πρότερον βίον οὐκ ἀπὸ σεμνῆς διατριβῆς ὡρμᾶτο, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀμφὶ τὰς τελωνίας καὶ πλεονεξίας σχολαζόντων. Τοῦτο οὐδεὶς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ἐδήλωσεν, οὐχ ὁ συναπόστολος αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης, οὐδέ γε Λουκᾶς, οὐδὲ Μάρκος, οὐδὲ Ματθαῖος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ στηλιτεύων βίον καὶ κατήγορος αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γιγνόμενος. Ἐπάκουσον γοῦν ὅπως διαῤῥήδην ἐπ' ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ μέμνηται ἐν τῷ πρὸς αὐτοῦ γραφέντι Εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦτον λέγων τὸν τρόπον. "Καὶ παράγων ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, Ματθαῖον ὀνόματι, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἀκολούθει μοι. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἀνακειμένου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ." Καὶ πάλιν προϊὼν ἑξῆς, τόν τε κατάλογον τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξαριθμούμενος, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὸ τοῦ τελώνου ὄνομα προστίθησιν. Λέγει δ' οὖν· "Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστι ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Φίλιππος καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης." Οὕτως μὲν ὁ Ματθαῖος δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἐπιεικείας τὸ φιλάληθες ὑποφαίνων τοῦ ἰδίου τρόπου καὶ τελώνην ἑαυτὸν ἀπεκάλει, μὴ ἀποκρύπτων τὸν πρότερον ἑαυτοῦ βίον, καὶ τοῦ συζύγου δεύτερον ἑαυτὸν κατέλεγεν. Συνεζευγμένος γοῦν τῷ Θωμᾷ, ὁ Πέτρος Ἀνδρέᾳ καὶ Ἰάκωβος τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ Φίλιππος Βαρθολομαίῳ, προτάττει ἑαυτοῦ τὸν Θωμᾶν, προτιμῶν ὡς κρείττονα τὸν συναπόστολον, τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν τοὐναντίον πεποιηκότων. Ἄκουε γοῦν Λουκᾶ, πῶς, τοῦ Ματθαίου μνημονεύσας, οὐ τελώνην ὀνομάζει, οὐδ' ὑποτάττει τῷ Θωμᾷ, κρείττονα δὲ αὐτὸν εἰδὼς, πρῶτον αὐτὸν κατέλεξεν, δεύτερον τὸν Θωμᾶν ἐπαγαγών, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Μάρκος πεποίηκεν· ἔχουσι δὲ αὐτοῦ αἱ λέξεις οὕτως· "Καὶ ὅτε ἡμέρα ἐγένετο, ἐφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, Σίμωνα, ὃν καὶ ἐκάλεσε Πέτρον, καὶ

[4] Here follows the classification of the books as admitted, &c., given before at page 10. (Eus. H. E. III. 25.)

Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, καὶ Ματθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν." Οὕτως μὲν τὸν Ματθαῖον ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐτίμησεν, καθ' ἃ παρέδωκαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπαρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. Καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην δὲ ὁμοῖον εὕροις ἂν τῷ Ματθαίῳ. Ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μνήμην τῆς οἰκείας προσηγορίας ποιεῖται ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ ἀπόστολον, οὐδὲ εὐαγγελιστήν· ἐν δὲ τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ἐπισημηνάμενος, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἐδήλωσεν ὀνομαστὶ ἑαυτόν.

Ὅ γε μὴν Πέτρος οὐδὲ καθῆκεν ἐπὶ τὴν Εὐαγγελίου γραφὴν δι' εὐλαβείας ὑπερβολήν. Τούτου Μάρκος γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονὼς ἀπομνημονεῦσαι λέγεται τὰς τοῦ Πέτρου περὶ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διαλέξεις, ὃς ἐλθὼν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα τῆς ἱστορίας, ἐν οἷς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐρωτήσας, τίνα φασὶν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ αὐτοῦ μαθηταί, τίνα δόξαν ἔχοιεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὑπακούσαντος τοῦ Πέτρου, ὡς περὶ Χριστοῦ, οὐδὲν ἀποκρινάμενον τὸν Ἰησοῦν οὐδὲ λέγοντα αὐτῷ γράφει, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ παρῆν ὁ Μάρκος τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λεχθεῖσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Πέτρος τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λεχθέντα τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐδικαίου δι' οἰκείας προσφέρειν μαρτυρίας. Τίνα δὲ ἦν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν λεχθέντα, Ματθαῖος δηλοῖ διὰ τούτων· "Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Μακάριος εἶ Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ἐγώ σοι λέγω· Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πέτραν οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ἅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς· καὶ δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ὅσα ἂν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδέμενα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· καὶ ὅσα ἂν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς." Τοσούτων εἰρημένων τῷ Πέτρῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὁ Μάρκος μηδὲν τούτων μνημονεύσας, ὅτι μηδ' ὁ Πέτρος ταῦθ', ὡς εἰκὸς, ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίαις ἐξηγόρευσεν, ὅρα τί φησιν, ἐρωτήσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· "Ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ." Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος εἰκότως παρασιωπᾶσθαι ἠξίου· διὸ καὶ Μάρκος αὐτὰ παρέλιπεν· τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄρνησιν αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντας ἐκήρυξεν

ἀνθρώπους. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ πικρῶς. Εὕροις δ᾽ οὖν τὸν Μάρκον ἱστοροῦντα περὶ αὐτοῦ τάδε; "Καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν θερμαινόμενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει· Καὶ σὺ μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαραίου ἦς. Ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέγων· οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι τί σὺ λέγεις· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ἔξω προαύλιον, καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. Πάλιν δὲ ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη ἤρξατο λέγειν τοῖς παρεστῶσιν· Οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν· Ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνήσατο. Καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ· Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ. Ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν, ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον, ὃν λέγετε· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν." Μάρκος μὲν ταῦτα γράφει. Πέτρος δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖ· πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τῶν Πέτρου διαλέξεων εἶναι λέγεται Ἀπομνημονεύματα. Οἱ δὴ οὖν τὰ μὲν δόξαντα αὐτοῖς ἀγαθὴν φέρειν φήμην παραιτούμενοι, τὰς δὲ καθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν διαβολὰς εἰς ἄληστον αἰῶνα καταγράφοντες, καὶ τῶν πλημμεληθέντων αὐτοῖς τὰς κατηγορίας, ἃς οὐκ ἄν τις ἔγνω τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν ἔμαθεν φωνῆς καθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν στηλιτεύοντες, πῶς οὐ φιλαυτίας μὲν ἁπάσης καὶ ψευδολογίας ἐκτὸς γεγονέναι ἐνδίκως ἂν ὁμολογοῖντο, φιλαλήθους δὲ διαθέσεως σαφῆ καὶ ἐναργῆ τεκμήρια παρεσχηκέναι;

Οἱ δέ γε τοὺς τοιούσδε πεπλάσθαι καὶ καταψεύσασθαι νομίζοντες, καὶ οἷα πλάνοις βλασφημεῖν πειρώμενοι, πῶς οὐκ ἂν γένοιντο καταγέλαστοι; φίλοι μὲν φθόνου καὶ βασκανίας, ἐχθροὶ δὲ αὐτῆς ἀληθείας ἁλισκόμενοι, οἵ γε τοὺς οὕτως ἀπανούργους καὶ ἄπλαστον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀκέραιον ἦθος διὰ τῶν οἰκείων λόγων ἐπιδεδειγμένους, πανούργους τινὰς καὶ δεινοὺς ὑποτίθενται σοφιστὰς, ὡς τὰ μὴ ὄντα πλασαμένους καὶ τῷ οἰκείῳ διδασκάλῳ τὰ μὴ πρὸς αὐτοῦ πραχθέντα κεχαρισμένως ἀναθέντας. Ὡς εὖ μοι δοκεῖ εἰρῆσθαι· πάντα χρὴ πιστεύειν τοῖς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαθηταῖς, ἢ μή· καὶ εἰ μόνοις τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀπιστητέον, καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν, οἵτινές ποτ᾽ ἄρα παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν, ἢ παρὰ βαρβάροις βίους καὶ λόγους καὶ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐπί τισιν ἀγαθοῖς κατορθώμασι βοηθέντων συνεγράψαντο· ἢ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις πιστεύειν εὔλογον, μόνοις δὲ τούτοις ἀπιστεῖν. Καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἐμφανὴς ὁ φθόνος; Τί δέ; οἱ καταψευδόμενοι τοῦ διδασκάλου, καὶ τὰ μὴ γεγονότα τῇ αὐτῶν παραδιδόντες

γραφῇ, ἆρα καὶ τὰ πάθη κατεψεύσαντο αὐτοῦ; Τὴν ἑνὸς λέγω μαθητῶν προδοσίαν, καὶ τὴν τῶν συκοφαντῶν κατηγορίαν, χλεύας τε καὶ διασυρμοὺς δικαστῶν, τάς τε ὕβρεις καὶ τὰς πληγὰς τὰς κατὰ προσώπου, μάστιγάς τε κατὰ νώτου, καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀκανθῶν στέφανον ἐπὶ ἀτιμίᾳ περιτιθέμενον αὐτῷ, φοινικοῦν τε χιτῶνα ἐν χλαμύδος σχήματι περιβληθέντα, καὶ τέλος, αὐτὸν αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον ἐπικομίζοντα· ἐν τούτῳ τε πηγνυμένον, καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας καταπειρόμενον, ὄξει τε ποτιζόμενον, καὶ παιόμενον κατὰ κόρρης καλάμῳ, καὶ πρὸς τῶν ὁρώντων ὀνειδιζόμενον; Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα καὶ ὅσα τούτοις συμφέρεται ὁμοίως πεπλάσθαι χρὴ πρὸς τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν, ἢ ἐν τούτοις μὲν χρὴ πιστεύειν αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀληθεστάτοις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπιδόξοις καὶ σεμνοτέροις ἀπιστεῖν. Καὶ πόθεν τὸ περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐναντίον δόγμα συστήσεται; Τὸ γὰρ ἀληθεύειν τοὺς αὐτοὺς φάναι, καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ψεύδεσθαι, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἢ τἀναντία κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν.

Τίς οὖν ὁ τούτων ἔλεγχος; Εἰ γὰρ δὴ πλάττεσθαι αὐτοῖς σκοπὸς ἦν καὶ λόγοις ψευδέσι τὸν διδάσκαλον κοσμεῖν, οὐκ ἄν ποτε αὐτοῖς τὰ προειρημένα κατέγραφον, οὐδ' ἂν ἐδήλουν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνθρώποις, ὅτι δὴ ἐλυπεῖτο, καὶ ἠδημόνει καὶ τετάρακτο τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ αὐτὸν ἀπολιπόντες ᾤχοντο· ἢ ὅτι ὁ πάντων αὐτῶν προκεκριμένος ἀπόστολός τε καὶ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ Πέτρος βασάνων ἐκτὸς καὶ ἀρχοντικῆς ἀπειλῆς τρίτον αὐτὸν ἐξωμόσατο. Ταῦτα γὰρ κἂν ἄλλων λεγόντων, χρῆν δήπουθεν ἀρνεῖσθαι τοὺς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ χαρίζεσθαι τὰ σεμνότερα τῷ διδασκάλῳ προτεθειμένους. Εἰ δὲ φιλαλήθεις ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ σκυθρωποῖς διηγήμασι φαίνονται, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς ἐνδοξοτέροις εἶεν ἂν τοιοῦτοι. Τοὺς γὰρ ἅπαξ ψεύδεσθαι προελομένους, τὰ λυπηρὰ χρῆν μᾶλλον ἐκφυγεῖν ἤτοι διὰ σιωπῆς, ἢ διὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν ἀρνήσεως, μὴ ἄλλως τῶν ὀψιγόνων ἐλέγξαι δυναμένων τὰ σεσιγημένα. Διὰ τί γὰρ μὴ ἐψεύσαντο, καὶ ἔφησαν, ὅτι Ἰούδας μὲν ὁ προδοὺς αὐτὸν φιλήματι, τολμήσας τὸ σύμβολον ἐνδείξασθαι τῆς προδοσίας, ἀπολιθωθείη αὐτίκα· ὁ δὲ ῥαπίσαι αὐτὸν τολμήσας, ξηρὸς παραχρῆμα γένοιτο τὴν δεξιάν· ὁ δ' ἀρχιερεὺς Καϊάφας, ὡς ἂν συντρέχων τοῖς κατ' αὐτοῦ συκοφάνταις πηρωθείη τὰς ὄψεις; Διὰ τί δὲ μὴ ἐψεύσαντο πάντες, ὅτι μηδὲν σκυθρωπὸν ἀληθῶς περὶ αὐτὸν γέγονεν; Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἀφανὴς ἦν καταγελάσας αὐτῶν τοῦ δικαστηρίου· οἱ δὲ ἐπιβουλεύοντες, ὑπὸ φαντασίας θηλάτου πλανώμενοι, ἐνεργεῖν

κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ μὴ παρόντος ἐδόκουν; Τί δ᾽· ἆρα οὐκ ἦν σεμνότερον τοῦ πλάττεσθαι, ὅτι τῶν τοιῶνδε ποιητὴς ἔργων παραδόξων γέγονε, τὸ γράφειν ὅτι μηδὲν μὲν ἀνθρώπινον, μηδὲ θνητὸν περὶ αὐτὸν συνέβη, ἐνθέῳ δὲ δυνάμει τὰ πάντα καταδησάμενος, τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπάνοδον μετὰ θειοτέρας δόξης ἐποιήσατο; Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τούτοις ἀπιστεῖν ἔμελλον οἱ ταῖς ἄλλαις αὐτῶν διηγήσεσι πεπιστευκότες. Οἱ δ᾽ οὖν μηδὲν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τοῖς ἀπεμφαίνουσι καὶ σκυθρωποῖς παραχαράξαντες πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἶεν ἄξιοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς, οἷς ἐμαρτύρησαν αὐτῷ τὰ παράδοξα, φαύλης ἐκτὸς ὑπονοίας καθεστάναι;

Αὐτάρκης μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ τῶνδε τυγχάνει περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν μαρτυρία. Οὐδὲν δὲ οἷον ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τῷ ἐξ Ἑβραίων Ἰωσήπῳ μάρτυρι χρήσασθαι, ὃς ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς Ἰουδαικῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας, τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Πιλάτου χρόνους ἱστορῶν, μέμνηται τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐν τούτοις. [6] "Γίνεται δὲ κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ, εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τἀληθῆ σεβομένων· καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτῶν ἐνδείξει τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἀρχόντων σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Ὅθεν εἰσέτι νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦδε τῶν Χριστιανῶν οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον." Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἱστορικὸν μαρτυρεῖται, οὐ μόνον τοὺς δώδεκα ἀποστόλους, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητὰς ἐξῳκειωμένος, ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς μὲν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ, πολλοὺς δὲ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ προσαγόμενος, δῆλος ἂν εἴη περιττόν τι κεκτημένος παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως προσήγετο τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ πλείους εἰ μή τισι θαυμαστοῖς καὶ παραδόξοις ἔργοις, καὶ ξενιζούσῃ κέχρητο διδασκαλίᾳ; Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν Ἀποστόλων γραφή, ὅτι πολλαὶ μυριάδες ἦσαν Ἰουδαίων ἀνδρῶν πεπεισμένων αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν κατηγγελμένον· καὶ ἡ

[6] This celebrated passage from Josephus is generally believed to be interpolated. The doubtful passages ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν, and ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, κ.τ.λ. are perhaps marginal notes by a Christian reader which early crept into the Jewish historian's text.

ἱστορία δὲ κατέχει, ὡς καὶ μεγίστη τις ἦν ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων συγκροτουμένη, μέχρι τῶν χρόνων τῆς κατ᾽ Ἀδριανὸν πολιορκίας. Λέγονται γοῦν οἱ πρῶτοι κατὰ διαδοχὴν προστάντες αὐτόθι ἐπίσκοποι Ἰουδαῖοι γεγονέναι, ὧν καὶ ὀνόματα εἰσέτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις μνημονεύεται· ὡς καὶ ἐκ τούτων λελύσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν κατὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ διαβολὴν, ὅτε καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ δίχα τῆς αὐτῶν μαρτυρίας, μυρία ὁμολογεῖται πλήθη Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ δι᾽ ὧν ἐπετέλει παραδόξων ἔργων ὑφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν πεποιημένος. Ἀλλὰ τούτων ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρημένων, πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ἀπίστων τάγμα, φέρε, καὶ πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον στῖφος ἐνστῶμεν. Τοῦτο δὲ ἦν τὸ τῶν συνομολογούντων μὲν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὰ παράδοξα πεποιηκέναι, γοητείᾳ δὲ ἄλλως ἐπὶ πλάνῃ τῶν ὁρώντων, οἷα θαυματουργὸν ἢ φαρμακέα τινὰ, θαυμαστῶσαι τοὺς παρόντας.

15. Epiphanius.[1]

Haeres. II. t. 1. *h.* 51 (contra haeresim quae non suscipit Ev. Joannis et Apocalypsin). Ματθαῖος γὰρ πρῶτος ἄρχεται εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. Τούτῳ γὰρ ἦν ἐπιτεταγμένον τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον κηρύξαι ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ αἱρέσει περὶ τούτου διὰ πλάτους εἰρήκαμεν. Οὐδὲν δὲ ἡμᾶς λυπήσει καὶ αὖθις περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν διαλαμβάνειν, εἰς παράστασιν τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἔλεγχον τῶν πεπλανημένων. Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Ματθαῖος καταξιοῦται τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ δικαιότατα ἦν. Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐπιστρέψαντα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τελωνείου ἀναστάντα τῷ ἐλθόντι ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ λέγοντι·

[1] Epiphanius was still living and at work in extreme old age when Jerome wrote his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers (A.D. 392). He was a native of Palestine, Bishop of Constantia (Salamis) in Cyprus about A.D. 367. Seven or eight years afterwards he began his Panarium, or great work against Heresies. He wrote a book called the Ancorate, and one on weights and measures. He is an interesting but not trustworthy chronicler and is apt to let his fancy run away with him. But he has preserved interesting extracts from some heretical books, and several curious floating traditions regarding the Canonical Scriptures. (See Introduction: 'Gospel of Hebrews,' &c.) He denounced all apocryphal books, the only exception being his respectful references to a book he calls "The Constitution of the Apostles," concerning which see before, at page 25. See full discussion, Lardner, II. 421; Bunsen's Analecta Antenicaena; and Hefele's Hist. of Councils.

Οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν, εἰς ὑπόδειγμα ἡμῖν τῶν μελλόντων σώζεσθαι, τῷ ἐν τῷ τελωνείῳ ἀναχθέντι, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀδικίας ἀναστρέψαντι, παρασχέσθαι τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς σωτηρίας, ἵν' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μάθωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὴν τῆς παρουσίας φιλανθρωπίαν. Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐδωρήσατο αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ κάθαρσιν λέπρας, καὶ ἰαμάτων δυνάμεις, καὶ ἀπέλασιν δαιμόνων, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου πείσῃ τοὺς ἀκούοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου κηρύξαι εὐαγγέλια τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, ὅτι εὑρεθήσονται διὰ μετανοίας, καὶ τοῖς πεπτωκόσιν, ὅτι ἀναστήσονται, καὶ τοῖς τεθνηκόσιν, ὅτι ζωογονηθήσονται. Καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κηρύττει. Καὶ ἄρχεται οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ διηγεῖται μὲν τὴν γενεαλογίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ. . . .

Εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι· καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν. Οὗτος δὲ εἷς ἐτύγχανεν ἐκ τῶν ἑβδομηκονταδύο τῶν διασκορπισθέντων ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι, ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· Ἐὰν μὴ τίς μου φάγῃ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίῃ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος· ὡς τοῖς τὰ Εὐαγγέλια ἀναγνοῦσι σαφὴς ἡ παράστασις. Ὅμως διὰ Πέτρου ἀνακάμψας εὐαγγελίζεσθαι καταξιοῦται, πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἐμπεφορημένος. Ἄρχεται δὲ κηρύττειν, ὅθεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ παρεκελεύσατο, τὴν ἀρχὴν τάττων ἀπὸ πεντεκαιδεκάτου ἔτους Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, μετὰ ἔτη τριάκοντα τῆς τοῦ Ματθαίου πραγματείας. Δευτέρου δὲ γενομένου εὐαγγελιστοῦ, καὶ μὴ περὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν καταγωγῆς Θεοῦ Λόγου τηλαυγῶς σημάναντος· ἀλλὰ πάντη μὲν ἐμφαντικῶς, οὐ μὴν κατὰ ἀκριβολογίαν τοσαύτην, γέγονε τοῖς προειρημένοις, εἰς δεύτερον σκότωσιν τῶν διανοημάτων, τοῦ μὴ καταξιωθῆναι πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, λεγόντων αὐτῶν, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ δεύτερον Εὐαγγέλιον περὶ Χριστοῦ σημαῖνον, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ ἄνωθεν λέγων τὴν γέννησιν· ἀλλά φησιν· Ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ κατῆλθε τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ φωνή· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ταῦτα οὕτως ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀνοήτως ἐτελεῖτο, ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐπινύττει τὸν ἅγιον Λουκᾶν, ὡς ἀπὸ βάθους κατωτάτου (κατὰ) τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἠπατημένων ἀνενέγκαι, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων καταλειφθέντα αὖθις ἐπιβάλλεσθαι· ἵνα μή τις τῶν πεπλανημένων

ἠγήσεται μυθωδῶς αὐτὸν ἐκφράσαι τὴν γέννησιν. Ἔπειτα ἀνωφερῆ τὸν λόγον ἐργάζεται· διὰ δὲ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν λεπτομερῶς τὴν πᾶσαν πραγματείαν διέξεισι, καὶ εἰς παράστασιν ἀληθείας ἐμμάρτυρας τοὺς ὑπηρέτας τοῦ λόγου γενομένους παρεισάγει, φάσκων· Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν· ἵνα τινὰς μὲν ἐπιχειρητὰς δείξῃ, φημὶ δὲ τοὺς περὶ Κηρίνθον καὶ Μηρίνθον, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους. Εἶτα τί φησιν; Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ καθεξῆς παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν τοῖς αὐτόπταις καὶ ὑπηρέταις τοῦ λόγου γενομένοις, γράψαι σοι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε· εἴτουν τινὶ Θεοφίλῳ τότε γράφων τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, ἢ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ Θεὸν ἀγαπῶντι. Περὶ ὧν, φησὶ, κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. Καὶ τὴν μὲν κατήχησιν προτεταγμένην ἔφασκεν, ὡς ἤδη ὑπὸ ἄλλων μὲν κεκατηχῆσθαι, οὐκ ἀσφαλῶς δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν μεμαθηκέναι. Εἶτα τὴν ἀκρίβειάν φησιν· Ἐγένετο ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιᾶ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἱερεύς τις ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας, καὶ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρὼν, ᾗ ὄνομα Ἐλισάβετ. Καὶ ἄρχεται πρὸ τοῦ Ματθαίου. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ματθαῖος ἐσήμανε τριακονταετῆ χρόνον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· ὁ δὲ Μάρκος τὰ μετὰ τριάκοντα ἔταττεν ἔτη, τὴν ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ γενομένην ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πραγματείαν, ὅμοια τῷ Ματθαίῳ καὶ τῷ Λουκᾷ· ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος ἀπὸ τριακονταέτους χρόνου πρὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος πραγματείας τὸ διήγημα ἐποιεῖτο· Λουκᾶς δὲ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ συλληφθῆναι τὸν Σωτῆρα ἐν γαστρὶ, ἀπὸ ἓξ μηνῶν τὸν χρόνον ἐδήλου, καὶ ἐννέα μηνῶν πάλιν, καὶ ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν τῆς συλλήψεως τοῦ Κυρίου· ὡς εἶναι τὸν πάντα χρόνον τριάκοντα ἓν ἔτος καὶ ἐπέκεινα. . . . Ἐντεῦθεν λοιπὸν ἦν φανέρωσις, ὅτι τοῦ μὲν Θεοῦ ἦν υἱὸς, διὰ δὲ τοῦ σπέρματος τοῦ Ἀδὰμ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἐν σαρκὶ παρεγένετο. Ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἔσχον πάλιν φωτισμὸν οἱ πεπλανημένοι. Ἀντέλεγον δὲ τῷ λόγῳ, ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶντες ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ἔφασκον δὲ, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ τρίτον Εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπετράπη τῷ Λουκᾷ, ὄντι καὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα δύο τῶν διασκορπισθέντων ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Σωτῆρος λόγῳ, διὰ δὲ Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου, πάλιν ἐπανακάμψαντος πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, ἐπιτραπέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ κηρύξαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ κηρύττει πρῶτον ἐν Δαλματίᾳ, καὶ Γαλλίᾳ, καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, καὶ Μακεδονίᾳ. Ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐν τῇ Γαλλίᾳ· ὡς καὶ περί τινων τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀκολούθων λέγει ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῦ Ἐπιστολαῖς ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος· Κρίσκης, φησὶν, ἐν τῇ Γαλλίᾳ. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Γαλατίᾳ, ὥς τινες πλανηθέντες νομί-

ζουσιν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ Γαλλίᾳ.[2] Πλὴν ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἐλεύσομαι. Ἀνενέγκαντος γὰρ τοῦ Λουκᾶ τὰς γενεαλογίας, ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω, καὶ φθάσαντος τὴν ἔμφασιν ποιήσασθαι τῆς ἄνωθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου παρουσίας, ὁμοῦ τε συναφθέντος τῇ ἐνσάρκῳ αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίᾳ, ἵνα ἀποτρέψηται ἀπὸ τῶν πεπλανημένων τὴν πλάνην οὐκ ἐνενόησαν. Διὸ ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τὸν Ἰωάννην παραιτούμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι δι' εὐλάβειαν, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ γηραλέᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος. Καὶ μετὰ ἱκανὰ ἔτη τοῦ διατρίψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, ἀναγκάζεται ἐκθέσθαι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ χρεία περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου πραγματείας λεπτολογεῖν· ἤδη γὰρ ἠσφάλιστο. Ἀλλὰ ὡς κατόπιν τινῶν βαίνων, καὶ ὁρῶν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν ὄντας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τραχύτερα ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότας, καὶ πλάνας καὶ ἀκανθώδη, ἀνακαλέσασθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν προνοοῦντος, καὶ ἀσφαλιζομένου ἐπικηρυκεύσασθαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ εἶπε, Τί πλανᾶσθε, ποῖ τρέπεσθε; ποῖ πλανᾶσθε Κήρινθε καὶ Ἐβίων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι; οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτως, ὡς νομίζετε. Ναὶ ἐγεννήθη ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα, δῆλον. Ἰδοῦ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁμολογῶ, ὅτι Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. Ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐξότε ἐγένετο σὰρξ, νομίσητε τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ἀπὸ χρόνων Μαρίας μόνον, ὡς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἀφ' ὅτου γεννᾶται ὑπάρχει· πρὶν δὲ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι, οὐκ εἶναι. Ὁ δὲ ἅγιος Θεὸς Λόγος, υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστὸς Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ χρόνων Μαρίας μόνον, οὔτε ἀπὸ χρόνων Ἰωσὴφ μόνον, οὐτὲ Ἡλὶ, οὔτε Λευΐ, οὔτε Ζοροβάβελ, οὔτε Σαλαθιὴλ, οὔτε Νάθαν, οὔτε Δαβὶδ, οὔτε ἀπὸ Ἰακὼβ, οὔτε ἀπὸ Ἰσαὰκ, οὔτε ἀπὸ χρόνων τοῦ Ἀδὰμ, οὔτε Νῶε, οὔτε Ἀβραὰμ, οὔτε ἀπὸ τῆς πέμπτης ἡμέρας, οὔτε ἀπὸ τῆς τετάρτης ἡμέρας, οὔτε ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης, οὔτε ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας, οὔτε ἐξότου οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ γεγένηται, οὔτε ἐξότου ὁ κόσμος· ἀλλά· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν κ.τ.λ.

Ἵνα ἀπὸ τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν τὴν πᾶσαν κατά τε τὴν σάρκα, καὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα ἀκρίβειαν κατάσχωμεν.

Haeres. II. c. 2. h. 69. See below under 'Gospel of John.'

[2] 2 Tim. iv. 10. The N. T. reading is Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν. See however Eus. H. E. III. 4, Κρίσκης μὲν εἰς Γαλλίαν. Some read in Eusebius ἐπὶ τὰς Γαλλίας; and ἐπὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν is also found.

16. Jerome.[1]

Comment. in Mat. prooem. (T. IV. p. 2). Plures fuisse, qui Evangelia scripserunt, et Lucas Evangelista testatur, dicens: "Quoniam quidem multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem rerum, quae in nobis completae sunt, sicut tradiderunt nobis, qui ab initio ipsi viderunt Sermonem, et ministraverunt ei;" et perseverantia usque ad praesens tempus monimenta declarant: quae a diversis auctoribus edita, diversarum haereseon fuere principia, ut est illud juxta Ægyptios[2] et Thomam,[3] et Matthiam[4] et Bartholomaeum,[5] duodecim quoque apostolorum,[6] et Basilidis[7] atque Apellis,[8] ac reliquorum,[9] quos enumerare longissimum est: cum tantum in praesentiarum hoc necesse sit dicere: exstitisse quosdam, qui sine spiritu et gratia Dei conati sunt magis ordinare narrationem, quam historiae texere veritatem. Quibus jure potest illud propheticum coaptari: "Vae qui prophetant de corde suo: qui ambulant post spiritum suum, qui dicunt: Haec dicit Dominus: et Dominus non misit eos." De quibus et Salvator in Evangelio Joannis loquitur: "Omnes qui ante me venerunt, fures et latrones fuerunt." Qui venerunt, non qui missi sunt. Ipse enim ait: "Veniebant, et ego non mittebam eos." In venientibus, praesumptio temeritatis: in missis, obsequium servitutis est. Ecclesia autem, quae supra petram Domini voce fundata est, quam introduxit rex in cubiculum suum, et ad quam per foramen descensionis occultae misit manum suam, similis damulae hinnuloque cervorum, quatuor flumina paradisi instar eructans, quatuor angulos et annulos habet, per quos quasi arca Testamenti et custos Legis Domini, lignis immobilibus vehitur. Pri-

[1] Born at Strido (Dalmatia) A.D. 329: died at Bethlehem A.D. 420.

[2] See Introduction 'Gospel of Egyptians;' and below for extracts from it.

[3] Gospel of Thomas, a well-known Apocryphal Gospel; see Introduction "Apoc. Gospels."

[4] Matthias, Eus. H. E. III. 25, says the Heretics circulated Gospels pretending to be by Peter and Thomas and Matthias.

[5] Bartholomew is said (Eus. H. E. V. 10) to have taken Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew to India (Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου γραφήν), where Pantaenus found it cherished by the Christians. See below.

[6] 'Twelve Apostles:' another name for 'Gospel of the Hebrews.'

[7] Basilides: see Introduction.

[8] Apelles: said to have been the author of an Apocryphal Gospel.

[9] See Introduction 'Apoc. Gospels.'

mus omnium est Matthaeus publicanus, cognomento Levi, qui Evangelium in Judaea Hebraeo sermone edidit, ob eorum vel maxime causam, qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judaeis, et nequaquam Legis umbram, succedente Evangelii veritate, servabant. Secundus Marcus, interpres apostoli Petri, et Alexandrinae ecclesiae primus episcopus, qui Dominum quidem Salvatorem ipse non vidit, sed ea, quae magistrum audierat praedicantem, juxta fidem magis gestorum narravit, quam ordinem.[10] Tertius Lucas medicus, natione Syrus Antiochensis (cujus laus in evangelio) qui et ipse discipulus apostoli Pauli, in Achaiae, Boeotiaeque partibus volumen condidit, quaedam altius repetens, et ut ipse in prooemio confitetur, audita magis quam visa describens. Ultimus Joannes apostolus et evangelista, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, qui supra pectus Domini recumbens, purissima doctrinarum fluenta potavit, et qui solus de cruce meruit audire: "Ecce mater tua." Is cum esset in Asia, et jam tunc haereticorum semina pullularent, Cerinthi, Ebionis, et ceterorum qui negant Christum in carne venisse (quos et ipse in epistola sua Antichristos vocat, et apostolus Paulus frequenter percutit) coactus est ab omnibus pene tunc Asiae episcopis et multarum ecclesiarum legationibus, de divinitate Salvatoris altius scribere, et ad ipsum (ut ita dicam) Dei Verbum, non tam audaci, quam felici temeritate prorumpere. Unde et ecclesiastica narrat historia, cum a fratribus cogeretur ut scriberet, ita facturum se respondisse, si indicto jejunio in commune omnes Deum deprecarentur: quo expleto, revelatione saturatus, in illud prooemium e coelo veniens eructavit: "In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum; hoc erat in principio apud Deum." Haec igitur quatuor Evangelia multo ante praedicta, Ezechielis quoque volumen probat, in quo prima Visio ita contexitur: "Et in medio sicut similitudo quatuor animalium: et vultus eorum facies hominis, et facies leonis, et facies vituli, et facies aquilae." Prima hominis facies Matthaeum significat, qui quasi de homine exorsus est scribere: "Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham." Secunda Marcum, in quo vox leonis in eremo rugientis auditur: "Vox clamantis in deserto,

[10] Compare Papias: οὐ μέντοι τάξει (p. 56); and for what follows see Muratorian Fragment (p. 5).

parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas ejus." Tertia vituli, quae evangelistam Lucam a Zacharia sacerdote sumpsisse initium praefigurat. Quarta Joannem evangelistam, qui assumptis pennis aquilae, et ad altiora festinans, de verbo Dei disputat. Caetera quae sequuntur, in eundem sensum proficiunt. Crura eorum recta, et pennati pedes, et quocunque ibat spiritus, ibant, et non revertebantur: et dorsa eorum plena oculis, et scintillae ac lampades in medio discurrentes, et rota in rota, et in singulis quatuor facies. Unde et Apocalypsis Joannis, post expositionem viginta quatuor seniorum, qui tenentes citharas ac phialas, adorant Agnum Dei, introducit fulgura, et tonitrua, et septem spiritus discurrentes, et mare vitreum, et quatuor animalia plena oculis, dicens: "Animal primum simile leoni: et secundum simile vitulo: et tertium simile homini: et quartum simile aquilae volanti." Et post paululum: "Plena erant," inquit, "oculis, et requiem non habebant die ac nocte, dicentia: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus omnipotens, qui erat, et qui est, et qui venturus est."

Quibus cunctis perspicue ostenditur, quatuor tantum debere Evangelia suscipi, et omnes Apocryphorum naenias mortuis magis haereticis, quam ecclesiasticis vivis canendas.

Praefatio in IV. Evang. ad Damas. Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur, quatuor tantum Evangelia, quorum ordo est iste: Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Joannes, codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed et veterum: nec quae multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent.

[*Note.* On the nature of the testimony to our Gospels to be drawn from the Apocryphal Gospels, &c., see Introduction; and for illustrations see the last part of this work.]

V.

THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS AND THE SYNOPTISTS.

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 4. 3. *Τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἤγγικε, περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, ὡς Ἐνὼχ λέγει, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ δεσπότης συντέτμηκε τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ἡμέρας, ἵνα ταχύνῃ ὁ ἠγαπημένος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν ἥξῃ.*[2] (Compare Mat. xxiv. 6, 22; Mark xiii. 7.)

C. 4. 14. *Ἔτι δὲ κἀκεῖνο, ἀδελφοί μου, νοεῖτε· ὅταν βλέπητε μετὰ τηλικαῦτα σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οὕτως ἐγκαταλελεῖφθαι αὐτούς, προσέχωμεν μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθῶμεν.*[3] (Mat. (xx. 16?); xxii. 14).

C. 5. 9. *Ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δι-*

[1] The following citations from Barnabas are of uncertain value, mainly because of the uncertain age of the Epistle, and because of the divergences in the MSS of the text. But it is more natural to account for the form of the quotations by supposing Barnabas to have had at least Matthew and possibly Luke in his hands, than to suppose in each case that he was referring to some (non-extant) Apocryphal book. See Introduction on 'Barnabas.'

[2] The Latin reads "*Sicut Daniel dicit.*" The words are not in Enoch as we have it. Hilg. refers (but the reference is forced) to "Enoch lxxxix. 61, &c., xc. 17;" see also Sup. Rel. I. 237. For συντέτμηκεν compare Dan. ix. 24. We cannot find more than correspondence of idea between the passage and the Synoptists. Even if the passage be suggested by Enoch, it is doubtful whether the εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κ.τ.λ. belong to it. Hilg. points λέγει. (so as to stop the reference).

[3] This passage is preceded by a warning against sleeping in sin lest the wicked potentate should have power to exclude us from the kingdom of the Lord. There is a possible allusion to Mat. xxv. 5, &c., but not so clear as to induce us to quote. In our text the phrase ὡς γέγραπται is remarkable, as the first quotation from our Lord's words with similar reference to the written record. His words are often quoted, but not as from Scripture. To deny, as some do, that these words are from Matthew's Gospel which we have in our hands, and to ascribe them to the lost Greek of 4 Ezra viii. 3 (of which the Latin is *Nam multi creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur*), is surely an extraordinary proceeding. The same word γέγραπται occurs in the previously quoted passage, c. 4, 3; but whether or how far in reference to Enoch is really doubtful. But the fact that it does occur may make us hesitate to found more upon it here than that it proves Barnabas to be quoting from Matthew as a written record of our Lord's sayings.

καίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς, τότε ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν Θεοῦ.[4] (Compare Mat. ix. 13.)

C. 5. 12. *Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὴν πληγὴν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν· Ὅταν πατάξωσι τὸν ποιμένα αὐτῶν, τότε ἀπολεῖται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης.*[5] (Compare Mat. xxvi. 31.)

C. 7. 11. *Οὕτω, φησὶν, οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν, καὶ ἅψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας, ὀφείλουσι θλιβέντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με.*[6] (Compare Mat. xvi. 24.)

C. 12. 11. *Ἐπεὶ οὖν μέλλουσι λέγειν ὅτι Χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυίδ ἐστιν, αὐτὸς προφητεύει Δαυὶδ, φοβούμενος καὶ συνιὼν τὴν πλάνην τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν· Εἶπεν Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Καὶ πάλιν λέγει οὕτως Ἡσαΐας· Εἶπε Κύριος τῷ Χριστῷ μου Κυρίῳ, οὗ ἐκράτησα τῆς δεξιᾶς αὐτοῦ ἐπακοῦσαι ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἔθνη, καὶ ἰσχὺν βασιλέων διαρρήξω. Ἴδε πῶς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν Κύριον καὶ υἱὸν οὐ λέγει.*[7] (Compare Mat. xxii. 45.)

C. 15. 8. *Πέρας γέ τοι λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τὰς νεομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα οὐκ ἀνέχομαι. Ὁρᾶτε πῶς λέγει· Οὐ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκτὰ, ἀλλὰ ὃ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ καταπαύσας τὰ*

[4] Cod. ℵ and I (Bryennios) and old Latin agree in the reading. The common text added εἰς μετάνοιαν after ἁμαρτωλούς. This same quotation appears 2 Clem. c. 2. 4, with the preface ετέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι. See also Justin, Apol. I. c. 15, where we have it with the addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν and the preface εἶπε δὲ οὕτως. Origen cont. Cels. I. 63 defends the character of the Apostles against the charges which Celsus had advanced, founding probably, as Origen thinks, on this expression "in the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas." Christ's saying *may* have been preserved in some "original Spruch-Sammlung," or in "many other works" as some say—it is impossible to disprove such hypotheses—but as a matter of fact we have it in St. Matthew.

[5] The old Greek text had σκορπισθήσεται. This is also found in a correction of ℵ. The old Latin was peculiar: "Dicit autem Esaias *Plaga corporis illius omnes sanati sumus*, et alius propheta *Feriam pastorem et dispargentur oves gregis.*" Compare Isaiah liii. 5; Zech. xiii. 7. Bryennios's MS reads ἀπολεῖται.

[6] Those words do not occur in any extant Gospel, canonical or apocryphal. Neither can they be referred to 4 Ezra vii. 14 (Hilg.). The words in 4 Ezra are: *Si ergo non ingredientes ingressi fuerint qui vivunt angusta et mala haec, non poterunt recipere quae sunt reposita.* Compare Mat. xvi. 24 and Acts xiv. 22, which furnish a basis for the saying.

[7] This passage is a reference to the O. T. Although it cannot be pressed as coming through the canonical Gospel, the short comment of Barnabas upon it naturally suggests that he took his interpretation of the Psalm from our Lord's words in St. Matthew. The readings in the whole passage vary. It is usually printed καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ. But ℵ and Bryennios's MS, with the Latin, support the text as above.

πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποίησω, ὅ ἐστιν ἄλλου κόσμου ἀρχή. Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς.[8] (Compare Mark xvi. 14, &c.; Luke xxiv. 51; and on the other hand Mat. xxviii. 10; Acts i. 3.)

C. 19. 11. *Παντὶ [τῷ] αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου.*[9] (Compare Mat. v. 42; Luke vi. 30.)

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.

C. 13.[1] *Ταπεινοφρονήσωμεν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ἀλαζονείαν καὶ τῦφον καὶ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ὀργὰς καὶ ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον — λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* (Jer. ix. 23)· *Μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ μηδὲ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ*

[8] This passage is cited here because it has been used by Hilgenfeld (Barnabas, p. 118) and Reuss (Gesch. § 234) to show that 'Barnabas' was written in the first century, before the exclusive authority of "our Gospels" was established. It appears to contradict them all (says Reuss) save the third. But in that case Acts contradicts Luke, and the truth is that to group the Resurrection and Ascension together is quite consistent with fuller accounts which detail miraculous appearances between. Besides there is indefinite time in φανερωθείς.

[9] These words are in the common Greek Text and in the Sinaitic corrector's text (seventh century), following the words Οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι, οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις. They are omitted in ℵ *primâ manu* and in I (Bryennios's MS). The Old Latin wants chapters 18-21, so that we cannot appeal to it. Gebhardt omits the words, now also Hilg. (1877).

[1] This passage begins with Jeremiah and ends with Isaiah, the first quotation being in words suggested by 1 Cor. i. 31 (2 Cor. x. 17, see also 1 Kings ii. 10); and its main passage is an abridgment or echo of passages from the Sermon on the Mount. There is no doubt that the only difficulty in believing that Clement consciously abridged Matthew or Luke lies in the "unusual length and roundness and compactness" of the passage. But if we allow that he was writing from memory (which is possible), and if he was accumulating precepts to enjoin lowly-mindedness because of the retribution which awaits harsh judgments and self-righteousness (which is certain), this difficulty is in great measure removed. It is worth while to compare Polycarp's form of quotation of the same passage (see below page 112)) and Justin's χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες Apol. I. 15; Dial. 96. Those who will have Clement to be quoting some "well-known record" (which is not our Canonical Gospels), and who will have it to be "careful and precise quotation of the very words," need to have another well-known source for Polycarp, and at least two others for Justin, who (as usual) is not verbally consistent with himself. They have to meet also the fact that those "very words" are not found in any extant Gospel. The clause χρηστεύεσθε κ.τ.λ. is not in our Gospels, though it suggests Justin's words. The order of the clauses varies in the MSS, ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε κ.τ.λ. being in Bryennios's MS put before the two precepts which immediately precede it in our text.

LIBRARY
WEST'N THEO. SEM'Y,
WASHINGTON BOUL'D,
CHICAGO

ἰσχὺϊ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην· — μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησε διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. Οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν· Ἐλεεῖτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε; ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε οὕτω δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε οὕτω κριθήσεσθε· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. Ταύτῃ τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασι τούτοις στηρίξωμεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὑπηκόους ὄντας τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ταπεινοφρονοῦντες (Mat. v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 1, 2; Luke vi. 31, 37 &c.), φησὶ γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος· Ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν πραῢν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντά μου τὰ λόγια; (Is. lxvi. 2.)

C. 15. 1. *Τοίνυν κολληθῶμεν τοῖς μετ' εὐσεβείας εἰρηνεύουσιν, καὶ μὴ τοῖς μεθ' ὑποκρίσεως βουλομένοις εἰρήνην. Λέγει γάρ που· Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.*[2]

C. 46. *Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Εἶπεν γάρ· Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι· κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι.*[3] (Compare Mat. xxvi. 24, xviii. 6; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2, &c.)

[2] This reference is to Isaiah xxix. 13; but the author does not seem to remember the original, and what he quotes is the peculiar form in Mark vii. 6. The text of the LXX is ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσίν με. (See this more nearly reproduced in Mat. xv. 8.) The form of Clement is exactly that of Mark, save that he has ἄπεστιν for ἀπέχει. See the similar quotation of Jeremiah through St Paul in 1 Clem. c. 13 (quoted above). See also the almost identical form in 2 Clem. c. 3, the only change being ὁ λαὸς οὗτος.

[3] On the whole this passage does not give grounds for asserting that its author used our canonical Gospels; but it is not inconsistent with the supposition that he did. His variations from them all are not greater than those of Mark and Luke from each other. Compare Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 18. p. 561: Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι (Mat. xxvi. 24), κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς θάλασσαν ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι (Mat. xviii. 6). And Hom. XII. 29 Ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας προφήτης ἔφη· τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ, μακάριος δὲ, φησὶν, δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. Ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. These are illustrations of the freedom of quota-

C. 58. 2. *Ζῇ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ζῇ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἥ τε πίστις καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ μετ᾽ ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας ἀμεταμελήτως τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ δεδομένα δικαιώματα καὶ προστάγματα οὗτος προστεταγμένος καὶ ἐλλόγιμος ἔσται εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι᾽ οὗ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.* (Mat. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Rom. xi. 29.)

Second Epistle.[1]

A. CITATIONS WHICH MAY BE TAKEN AS AGREEING WITH THE SYNOPTISTS.

C. 2. 4. *Καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι Οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.*[2] (Mat. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17.)

C. 3. 2. *Λέγει δὲ καὶ αὐτός· Τὸν ὁμολογήσαντά με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου.*[3] (Mat. x. 32.)

C. 4. 2. *Λέγει γάρ· Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε, Κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην.* (Mat. vii. 21.)

C. 6. 1. *Λέγει δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν. Ἐὰν ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν καὶ Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ, ἀσύμφορον ἡμῖν ἐστίν. Τί γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, ἐάν τις τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῇ;*[4] (Luke xvi. 13; Mat. xvi. 26.)

C. 9. 11. *Καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· Ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου.*[5] (Mat. xii. 50.)

C. 13. 4. *Ὅταν γὰρ ἀκούσωσι παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ὅτι λέγει ὁ Θεός· Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ*

tion. Tertullian says that Marcion had (Luke xvii) *expedisse ei si natus non fuisset* of the author of offences. See also Origen, Com. in Num. XXV. 1.

[1] This work, now complete in the MS published by Bryennios, is clearly a Homily of early date. As to its age and characteristics see Introduction.

[2] See before, page 103 note on Barn. c. 5. 9.

[3] Though this is not verbatim, it is as near to a verbal quotation as preachers in our own day can be depended upon to give.

[4] The first sentence—the avowed quotation—is Luke xvi. 13 verbatim (compare Mat. vi. 24 where οἰκέτης is wanting); the third sentence is not verbatim, but resembles Matthew's τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ;

[5] See note (3).

χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς. (Luke vi. 32 &c.)

C. 17. 5. *Καὶ ὄψονται τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κράτος οἱ ἄπιστοι.* (Mat. xxiv. 50.)

B. CITATIONS WHICH CANNOT BE REGARDED AS AGREEING WITH THE SYNOPTISTS.

C. 4. 5. *Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· Ἐὰν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν· Ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστὲ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας.*[6]

C. 5. 2-4. *Μὴ φοβηθῶμεν ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος· Ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία; Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτένοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.*[7] (Compare Luke x. 3; Mat. x. 16; Luke xii. 4; Mat. x. 28.)

C. 8. 5. *Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστίν. Ἆρα οὖν τοῦτο λέγει· τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν.*[8] (Compare Luke xvi. 10; Mat. xxv. 21.)

[6] This seems to justify the remark of Photius about our Ep. Πλὴν ὅτι ῥητά τινα ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ξενίζοντα παρεισάγει, ὧν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη ἀπήλλακτο παντελῶς. It is usually supposed that this is from the Gospel of the Egyptians. See below, quotation from c. 12, and Introduction.

[7] The Synoptic passages to which reference is made give the substance and many of the phrases of this quotation; but the narrative portion indicates another source. The 'Gospel of the Egyptians' is again conjectured. See Clem. Hom. XVII. 5 and Just. Apol. I. c. 19 for similar passages, but with the usual variations. Both for example have μὴ δυνάμενος τι ποιῆσαι; Justin has (like Clement) μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν and (like Luke) has not πυρός after γέενναν which the Homily has; while the Hom. has τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ μὴ δυναμένου τι ποιῆσαι which reminds us of Matthew's τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι. So far as those variations go they are not greater than those between the Synoptists; but the narrative is irreconcilable with the idea that the passage comes from a Canonical source.

[8] The form ἆρα οὖν is probably (as Hilg. conjectures) an explanation. Σφρα-

C. 12. 2. *Ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ὑπό τινος πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία,*[9] *εἶπεν· Ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ.*[10]

3. Hermas.[1]

Vis. II. 2. 8. *Μακάριοι ὑμεῖς ὅσοι οὐκ ἀρνήσονται τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν. Ὤμοσεν γὰρ Κύριος κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἀρνησαμένους τὸν Κύριον αὐτῶν ἀπεγνωρίσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν, τοὺς νῦν μέλλοντας ἀρνεῖσθαι ταῖς ἐρχομέναις ἡμέραις· τοῖς δὲ προτέρον ἀρνησαμένοις, διὰ τὴν πολυσπλαγχνίαν ἵλεως ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς.*[2] (Mat. x. 32. 33 and xxiv. 21.)

Vis. III. 6. 5. *Οὗτοί εἰσιν ἔχοντες μὲν πίστιν, ἔχοντες δὲ καὶ πλοῦτον τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Ὅταν γένηται θλῖψις, διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τὰς πραγματείας ἀπαρνοῦνται τὸν Κύριον αὐτῶν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῇ λέγω· Κυρία, πότε οὖν εὔχρηστοι ἔσονται εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομήν; Ὅταν, φησὶν, περικοπῇ αὐτῶν ὁ πλοῦτος*

γίς = Baptism. See Hermas, Sim. VIII. 6. But Eus. H. E. VI. 43, makes it = confirmation by the Bishop. This is recorded in connection with Novatus about the middle of the third century.

[9] Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 13. p. 553 says that the inquiry was by Salome πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, and that the Lord said: Ὅταν οὖν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ. He says that the words are from the 'Gospel of the Egyptians.' Here, as elsewhere, the want of verbal correspondence between the two quotations of (presumably) the same passage is to be noted.

[10] The author quotes (c. 11. 2) an unknown passage as ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος· Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι κ.τ.λ. In 1 Clem. 23. 3 there is the same passage Ταλαίπωροι κ.τ.λ. introduced by the words ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη; but the usual Patristic inaccuracy of citation is apparent on comparing the two forms of what is notwithstanding the same passage. Not only is there διστάζοντες τῇ ψυχῇ in one case and διστάζοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ in the other, and other similar minor variations; but in 1 Clem. the words of an important clause are ἰδοὺ γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συμβέβηκεν, while in 2 Clem. the clause runs ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν. See in the extracts from Justin, and Introduction ('Justin' and 'Clement') further proofs of this habitual looseness of citation, and its bearing on the assumption so often made that when two forms of citation of a Gospel occur in some ancient Christian writing they cannot both be from a Canonical source. See how our author (c. 13. 2) with λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος introduces a citation of Isaiah lii. 5, and goes on to give some pointed clauses which are not in our Scripture.

[1] See Introduction. The text is from Gebhardt and Harnack.

[2] This is only an echo, if it be even that. It is fainter in the Greek and the corrected Latin than it was in the Vulgate Latin, though even there faint enough.

ὁ ψυχαγωγῶν αὐτοὺς, τότε εὔχρηστοι ἔσονται τῷ Θεῷ. (Mat. xiii. 21, 22; xix. 21.)

Vis. III. 9. 5. *Βλέπετε τὴν κρίσιν τὴν ἐπερχομένην. Οἱ ὑπερέχοντες οὖν ἐκζητεῖτε τοὺς πεινῶντας ἕως οὔπω ὁ πύργος ἐτελέσθη· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τελεσθῆναι τὸν πύργον θελήσετε ἀγαθοποιεῖν, καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε τόπον.* (Luke xiii. 24 &c.)

Vis. III. 9. 7. *Νῦν οὖν ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις· μὴ γίνεσθε ὅμοιοι τοῖς φαρμακοῖς.* (Mat. xxiii. 6, but see afterwards under 'Hebrews' for the bearing of this passage.) Compare Mand. XI. 12.

Vis. IV. 2. 6. *Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀκούσασιν τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα καὶ παρακούσασιν· αἱρετώτερον ἦν αὐτοῖς τὸ μὴ γεννηθῆναι.* (Mat. xxvi. 24 and parallel passages.)

Mand. I. 1. *Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ πάντα χωρῶν, μόνος δὲ ἀχώρητος ὤν.*[3]

Mand. IV. 1. 1. *Ἐντέλλομαί σοι, φησὶν, φυλάσσειν τὴν ἁγνείαν καὶ μὴ ἀναβαινέτω σου ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας, ἢ περὶ πορνείας τινὸς, ἢ περὶ τοιούτων ὁμοιωμάτων πονηρῶν. Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν μεγάλην ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζῃ.* (Mat. v. 28.)

Mand. IV. 1. 6. *Τί οὖν, φημὶ, Κύριε, ποιήσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃ τῷ πάθει τούτῳ ἡ γυνή; Ἀπολυσάτω, φησὶν, αὐτὴν, καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μενέτω· ἐὰν δὲ ἀπολύσας τὴν γυναῖκα ἑτέραν γαμήσῃ, καὶ αὐτὸς μοιχᾶται.*[4] (Mat. v. 32; Luke xvi. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 11.)

Mand. IX. 8. *Σὺ οὖν μὴ διαλίπῃς αἰτούμενος τὸ αἴτημα τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ λήψῃ αὐτό. Ἐὰν δὲ ἐκκακήσῃς καὶ διψυχήσῃς αἰτούμενος, σεαυτὸν αἰτιῶ καὶ μὴ τὸν διδόντα σοι.* (Luke xviii. 1. Compare also 2 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 13 &c.)

Mand. XII. 6. 3. *Ἀκούσατε οὖν μου, καὶ φοβήθητε τὸν πάντα δυνάμενον, σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι, καὶ τηρεῖτε τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας, καὶ ζήσεσθε τῷ Θεῷ.* (Mat. x. 28.) See also Mand. VII.

[3] This is the passage quoted by Irenaeus IV. 20. 2. with such approval: καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα· πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον κ.τ.λ. See Eus. H. E. V. 8, where speaking of Irenaeus he says: Οὐ μόνον δὲ οἶδεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδέχεται, τὴν τοῦ ποιμένος γραφὴν, λέγων κ.τ.λ. It may refer to 1 Cor. i. 28.

[4] The sin referred to is that of a Christian husband whose (Christian) wife is guilty of adultery. He is to receive her back if she repents, and not to marry again lest he take away from her the occasion of repentance. This is to hold good for one occasion.

Sim. V. 6. 1.[5] *Ἄκουε φησίν· εἰς δούλου τρόπον [οὐ] κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα.* (Mat. xxviii. 18.)

Sim. VIII. 3. 1. *Λέγω αὐτῷ· Κύριε, τὸ δένδρον τοῦτο γνώρισόν μοι τί ἐστιν· ἀποροῦμαι γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τοσούτων κλάδων κοπέντων ὑγιές ἐστι τὸ δένδρον καὶ οὐδὲν φαίνεται κεκομμένον ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ· ἐν τούτῳ οὖν ἀποροῦμαι. Ἄκουε φησί· Τὸ δένδρον τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τὸ σκεπάζον πεδία καὶ ὄρη καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, νόμος Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ δοθεὶς εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον· ὁ δὲ νόμος οὗτος υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἐστὶ κηρυχθεὶς εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς· οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην λαοὶ ὄντες, οἱ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ κηρύγματος καὶ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν.* (Mat. xiii. 31; Mark iv. 30.)

Sim. IX. 20. 2. *Οἱ δὲ πλούσιοι δυσκόλως κολλῶνται τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ Θεοῦ, φοβούμενοι μή τι αἰτισθῶσιν ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν. Οἱ τοιοῦτοι οὖν δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (Mat. xix. 23 &c.) Compare also Mand. X. 5 (Mat. xiii. 22).

Sim. IX. 29. 3. *Οἱ πιστεύσαντες τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν· ὡς νήπια βρέφη εἰσίν . . . πάντα γὰρ τὰ βρέφη ἔνδοξά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πρῶτα παρ᾽ αὐτῷ. Μακάριοι οὖν ὑμεῖς, ὅσοι ἂν ἄρητε ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν τὴν πονηρίαν ἐνδύσησθε δὲ τὴν ἀκακίαν· πρῶτοι πάντων ζήσεσθε τῷ Θεῷ.* (Mat. xviii. 3, 4; 1 Pet. ii. 2.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

Eph. c. 5. 2. *Εἰ γὰρ ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχὴ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν*

[5] The long passage Sim. v. 2 contains a parable of a lord of a vineyard who intrusted it to a faithful servant to fence it round. The servant also however cleared it of weeds and dug it. The lord when he returned not only gave him his freedom (which he had promised if he kept his trust), but made him heir along with his son (συγκληρονόμον τῷ υἱῷ μου). The lord in his gladness next gave many robes to this honoured servant, and he, in turn, of his own freewill shared them with the other servants, which the lord told with joy to his son and his friends. The explanation is given in § 3, and is that if we do anything in addition to the command of the Lord we shall have additional honour. From this the author goes on to urge distribution of superfluous wealth among the poor and needy (James i. 27). The passage may be an echo of Mat. xxiv. 45, and of John xv., but it is impossible to found upon it. There is a beautiful passage, Sim. v. 6, 1, 2: Ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσε τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι τὸν λαὸν ἔκτισε καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κατέστησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς τοῦ συντηρεῖν αὐτούς· καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐκαθάρισε πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ πολλοὺς κόπους ἠντλησώς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ [ἀμπελὼν] δύναται σκαφῆναι ἄτερ κόπου ἢ μόχθου. In the course of the Similitudes are many passages reminding us of the Gospels, and that is all we can say of them.

[1] Under the more general head of 'New Testament' are passages showing

ἔχει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἥ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας. (Mat. xviii. 16-29.)

Eph. c. 11. 1. *Τὴν μέλλουσαν ὀργὴν φοβηθῶμεν.* (Mat. iii. 7.)

Eph. c. 14. 2. *Οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει, οὐδὲ ἀγάπην κεκτημένος μισεῖ· φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ· οὕτως οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστοῦ εἶναι, δι' ὧν πράσσουσιν ὀφθήσονται.* (Mat. xii. 33.)

Eph. c. 17. 1. *Διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν.* (Mat. xxvi. 7.)

Eph. c. 18. 2. *Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου· ὃς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ.* (Mat. i. 18 &c.; Luke i. 33; John vii. 42; Rom. vi. 3. See also Ign. ad Smyrn. c. 1.)

Eph. c. 19. 2. *Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν; ἀστὴρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάλητον ἦν καὶ ξενισμὸν παρεῖχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ.*[2] (Mat. ii.)

Magn. c. 9. 3. *Οὗ καὶ οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι, ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν.* (Mat. xxvii. 52.)

Trall. c. 11. 1. *Φεύγετε οὖν τὰς κακὰς παραφυάδας, τὰς γεννώσας καρπὸν θανατηφόρον, οὗ ἐὰν γεύσηταί τις, παρ' αὐτὰ ἀποθνήσκει· οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν φυτεία πατρός.* (Mat. xv. 13.)

Smyrn. c. 1. 1. *Βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.* (Mat. iii. 15.)

Smyrn. c. 3. 1. *Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα, καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν κραθέντες τῇ σάρκι αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.*[3] (See Luke xxiv. 36-41, and John xx. 20-22.)

that Ignatius referred to the "Gospel" known as an authority to those whom he addressed. The following bear on his use of our Synoptists in details. See also under 'Matthew,' and Introduction, 'Ignatius,' for Echoes of the New Testament.

[2] The Curetonian has an obscure reading, "the three sacred mysteries which were done in the tranquillity of God from the Star."

[3] Eusebius (H. E. III. 36) quotes these words as far as ἐπίστευσαν, saying that he does not know where Ignatius took them from. Origen says they are from the 'Preaching of Peter' and Jerome refers them to the 'Gospel of the

Smyrn. c. 6. 1. Ὁ χωρῶν χωρείτω. (Mat. xix. 12.)

Polycarp. c. 2. 2. Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὄφις ἐν ἅπασιν· καὶ ἀκέραιος εἰς ἀεὶ ὡς ἡ περιστερά. (Mat. x. 16.)

Mart. Ign. (Vatic.) c. 2. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος θήσομαι, ἐὰν ὅλον τὸν κόσμον κερδήσω, τὴν δὲ ψυχήν μου ζημιωθῶ; Τραΐανος εἶπεν· Ἔοικάς μοια ἰσθήσεως ἐμφρόνου ἄμοιρος εἶναι, διὰ τοῦτο ἐξεντελίξεις μου τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.

5. Polycarp.

Ep. to Philipp. c. 2. 3. Μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων· μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε; ἀφίετε καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν· ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· [ἐν] ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. Καὶ, ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ, καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.[1] (Mat. v. 3, 7, 10; vii. 1, 2; Luke vi. 20, 36, 37, 38.)

C. 6. 1. Μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας. Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῇ, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. (Compare Mat. vi. 12—14.)

C. 7. 2. Δεήσεσιν αἰτούμενοι τὸν παντεπόπτην Θεὸν, μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής. (Compare Mat. vi. 13; xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38.)

C. 12. 3. Pro omnibus sanctis orate. Orate etiam pro regibus et potestatibus et principibus, atque pro persequentibus et odientibus vos, et pro inimicis crucis, ut fructus vester manifestus sit in omnibus, ut sitis in illo perfecti. (Compare Mat. v. 44, 48; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.)

Hebrews.' They are not very unlike what we have in our Gospels, and the form in the 'Gospel of the Hebrews' seems to have been remembered mainly because of the peculiar phrase δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον, on the metaphysical meaning of which Origen enlarges. (See Hilg. N. T. Extra Can. Rec. Fasc. IV. pp. 29, 62; and below, 'Gospel of the Hebrews.')

[1] See, on this passage, Introduction, 'Polycarp.' It is enough to observe here that the passage seems to be a quotation from memory; here, as in Clement (see before, p. 105), the clause ἐλεεῖτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε being changed from μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, so as to give it the same form as the previous clauses in the Imperative. The order differs from that of Clement, so as to prevent our referring this passage and that in Clement to one written source different from our canonical Gospels. Compare the way in which Polycarp cites and uses 1 Pet. ii. 20. (See note under 1 Peter, 'Polycarp.')

6. Martyrdom of Polycarp.[1]

C. 7. 1. *Ἔχοντες οἶν τὸ παιδάριον, τῇ παρασκευῇ περὶ δείπνου ὥραν ἐξῆλθον διωγμῖται καὶ ἱππεῖς μετὰ τῶν συνήθων αὐτοῖς ὅπλων, ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν τρέχοντες.* (Mat. xxvi. 55. Compare John xix. 14 for *παρασκευή*.)

C. 14. 1. *Ὁ δὲ [Πολύκαρπος] ὀπίσω τὰς χεῖρας ποιήσας καὶ προσδεθείς, ὥσπερ κριὸς ἐπίσημος ἐκ μεγάλου ποιμνίου εἰς προσφορὰν, ὁλοκαύτωμα δεκτὸν τῷ Θεῷ ἡτοιμασμένον, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶπε· "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Mat. iii. 17; xii. 18; Acts iii. 14; iv. 27, 30) *πατὴρ, δι' οὗ τὴν περί σου ἐπίγνωσιν εἰλήφαμεν, ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων καὶ δυνάμεων καὶ πάσης κτίσεως παντός τε τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων, οἳ ζῶσιν ἐνώπιόν σου· εὐλογῶ σε, ὅτι ἠξίωσάς με τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας ταύτης, τοῦ λαβεῖν μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ* (Mat. xx. 22) *τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς* (John v. 29) *αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου· ἐν οἷς προσδεχθείην ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον ἐν θυσίᾳ πίονι καὶ προσδεκτῇ, καθὼς προητοίμασας καὶ προεφανέρωσας καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.*" (John xvii. 3.)

[1] See Wieseler, Die Christenverfolgungen der Caesaren (1878); and Introduction.

VI.

GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

1. Papias.[1]

Eus. H. E. III. 40. *Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται· Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.*

2. Justin Martyr.[1] A.

Apol. I. c. 4. *p.* 55 *B.* Ὃν γὰρ τρόπον παραλαβόντες τινὲς παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου Χριστοῦ μὴ ἀρνεῖσθαι ἐξεταζόμενοι παρακελεύονται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κακῶς ζῶντες ἴσως ἀφορμὰς παρέχουσι τοῖς ἄλλως καταλέγειν τῶν πάντων Χριστιανῶν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν αἱρουμένοις. (Compare Mat. x. 33.)

Apol. I. c. 14. *p.* 61 *D.* Ἵνα δὲ μὴ σοφίζεσθαι ὑμᾶς δόξωμεν, ὀλίγων τινῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδαγμάτων ἐπιμνησθῆναι καλῶς ἔχειν πρὸ τῆς ἀποδείξεως ἡγησάμεθα, καὶ ὑμέτερον ἔστω ὡς δυνατῶν βασιλέων ἐξετάσαι εἰ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα δεδιδάγμεθα καὶ διδάσκομεν. Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασιν· οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. (*C.* 15) Περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν· Ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Καί· Εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν· συμφέρει γάρ σοι μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθῆναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ. (Mark ix. 47; Mat. v. 29; xviii. 9.) Καί· Ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρὸς μοιχᾶται. Καί· Εἰσί τινες οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ ἐγεννήθησαν εὐνοῦχοι, εἰσὶ δὲ οἵ εὐνούχισαν

[1] See Introduction, 'Papias'; and before p. 53 : Fragments of Papias, &c.

[1] Justin resembles Matthew closely in the opening and closing incidents of the Life of Jesus Christ. The following quotations are in the order of their occurrence in the Apologies and Dialogue.

ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· πλὴν οὐ πάντες τοῦτο χωροῦσιν. (Mat. v. 32; xix. 11, 12.)

Apol. I. c. 15. *p.* 62 *C.* Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς δικαίους οὐδὲ τοὺς σώφρονας εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀκολάστους καὶ ἀδίκους. Εἶπε δὲ οὕτως· Οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.[2] (Mat. ix. 13; Luke v. 32.) Θέλει γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἢ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτοῦ.

Apol. I. c. 15. *p.* 62 *C.*[3] Περὶ δὲ τοῦ στέργειν ἅπαντας ταῦτα ἐδίδαξεν· Εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω· (Mat. v. 44; Luke vi. 28.) Εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς. Εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς δόξαν ποιεῖν ταῦτα ἔφη· (Mat. v. 42; Luke vi. 34.) Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδοτε καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε. Εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζητε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει καὶ λῃσταὶ διορύσσουσι· θησαυρίζετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει. Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ; Ἢ τί δώσει αὐτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα; (Mat. vi. 19; xvi. 26; Luke ix. 25.) Θησαυρίζετε οὖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει. Καί· Γίνεσθε δὲ χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες (Luke vi. 35; Mat. v. 45), ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οἰκτίρμων, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πονηρούς.[4] Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε δὲ τί φάγητε ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε. (Mat. vi. 25, 31-33.) Οὐχ ὑμεῖς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν

[2] εἰς μετάνοιαν is probably an addition to the passage in Matthew, but is part of the text in Luke. The clause θέλει &c. resembles Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

[3] The following passages give the substance of the Sermon on the Mount, the earlier parts resembling Luke more than Matthew. They follow the last extract.

[4] This is one of the passages which Justin cites more than once; and it appears in the following form in Dial. c. 96. p. 324 A: Γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος. Καὶ γὰρ τὸν παντοκράτορα Θεὸν χρηστὸν καὶ οἰκτίρμονα ὁρῶμεν, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐπὶ ἀχαρίστους καὶ δικαίους, καὶ βρέχοντα ἐπὶ ὁσίους καὶ πονηρούς. We have in this collocation a proof of Justin's method of free quotation. He varies here from himself as elsewhere from our Gospels. See for another form Clem. Hom. III. 57 with ἀγαθοί for χρηστοί. See also 1 Clem. 13 (before, p. 105, Apost. Fathers and Synopt.).

θηρίων διαφέρετε; καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τρέφει αὐτά. Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε τί φάγητε ἢ τί ἐνδύσησθε· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι τούτων χρείαν ἔχετε. Ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (compare Luke xii. 22-24, 34). *Καί· Μὴ ποιῆτε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* (Mat. vi. 1.)

Apol. I. c. 16. *p.* 63 *B. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνεξικάκους εἶναι καὶ ὑπηρετικοὺς πᾶσι καὶ ἀοργήτους ἃ ἔφη ταῦτά ἐστι· Τῷ τύπτοντί σου τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ τὸν αἴροντά σου τὸν χιτῶνα ἢ τὸ ἱμάτιον μὴ κωλύσῃς.* (Mat. v. 39, 40; Luke vi. 29.) *Ὃς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῇ, ἔνοχός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ.* (Mat. v. 22.) *Παντὶ δὲ ἀγγαρεύοντί σε μίλιον ἀκολούθησον δύο.* (Mat. v. 41.) *Λαμψάτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα βλέποντες θαυμάζωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* (Mat. v. 16.)[5]

Apol. I. c. 16. *p.* 63 *D.*[6] *Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνύναι ὅλως, τἀληθῆ δὲ λέγειν ἀεί, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο· Μὴ ὀμόσητε ὅλως, ἔστω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.* (Mat. v. 34, 37.) *Ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, οὕτως ἔπεισεν εἰπών· Μεγίστη ἐντολή ἐστι· Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε. Καὶ προσελθόντος αὐτῷ τινος καὶ εἰπόντος· Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων· Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα.*[7] (See Mat. iv. 10; xix. 16; xxii. 37; Mark xii. 30. Compare Dial. c. 93. p. 32 A.) *Οἳ δ' ἂν μὴ εὑρίσκωνται βιοῦντες ὡς ἐδίδαξε γνωριζέσθωσαν μὴ ὄντες Χριστιανοί, κἂν λέγωσιν διὰ γλώττης τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα· οὐ γὰρ τοὺς μόνον λέγοντας ἀλλὰ τοὺς καὶ τὰ ἔργα πράττοντας σωθήσεσθαι ἔφη. Εἶπε γὰρ*

[5] This injunction λαμψάτω seems to have been a favourite with the Valentinians.

[6] See also Clem. Hom. III. 56; XIX. 2. These words are often found with wonderful variation. See James v. 12; Epiph. Haer. 19. 2; Clem. Alex. V. 14; and an apparent allusion in the testimony of James prefixed to Clem. Hom. μὴ ὀρκίσαι, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἔξεστιν.

[7] For the reading of Jesus's answer we cannot appeal to Justin, as he has it in two forms. One is in the text and the other in Dial. c. 101. p. 328 A: Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; Εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

οὕτως· Οὐχὶ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με. (Mat. vii. 21; Luke x. 16; John xiv. 24.) [8] Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσί μοι· Κύριε Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν; Καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας. (Luke xiii. 26; Mat. vii. 22.) Τότε κλαυθμὸς ἔσται καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων ὅταν οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι λάμψωσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι πέμψωνται εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ. (Mat. xiii. 42, 43.) Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἥξουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἅρπαγες· [9] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς. Πᾶν δὲ δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν, ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται. (Mat. vii. 15, 16, 17, 19; xxiv. 5.)

Apol. I. c. 17. *p.* 64 *C.* Κατ' ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τοῦ καιροῦ προσελθόντες τινὲς ἠρώτων αὐτὸν, εἰ δεῖ Καίσαρι φόρους τελεῖν. Καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο· Εἴπατέ μοι, τίνος εἰκόνα τὸ νόμισμα ἔχει; Οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν· Καίσαρος. Καὶ πάλιν ἀνταπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς· Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος τῷ Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. (Mat. xxii. 15 &c.; Luke xx. 22-25.)

Apol. I. c. 31. *p.* 73 *A.* Ἐν δὴ ταῖς τῶν προφητῶν βίβλοις εὕρομεν προκηρυσσόμενον παραγινόμενον, γεννώμενον διὰ παρθένου, καὶ ἀνδρούμενον, καὶ θεραπεύοντα πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείροντα κ.τ.λ. (Mat. iv. 23.)

Apol. I. c. 33. *p.* 74 *D.* Καὶ πάλιν ὡς αὐτολεξεὶ διὰ παρθένου μὲν τεχθησόμενος διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαΐου προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως· Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν, καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. (Mat. i. 23; compare Isaiah vii. 14; see Luke i. 31.)

Apol. I. c. 61. *p.* 93 *D.* Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται· Ἐπ' ὀνόματος [10] γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ

[8] We have the same occurrence described in Dial. c. 76. p. 301 D furnishing in its variations another instance of Justin's untrustworthy mode of quotation. In both passages however Justin has ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν. (See the passage as quoted below.)

[9] See also Dial. c. 35. p. 253 B: Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύποι ἅρπαγες. In Matthew the present tense ἐρχόνται is used.

[10] These words suggest the Baptismal Formula.

δεσπότου Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. (Mat. xxviii. 19; John iii. 3-5.)

Apol. I. c. 63. p. 95 C. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς δὲ ὁ Χρισιὸς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν Ἰουδαῖοι τί πατὴρ καὶ τί υἱὸς, ὁμοίως ἐλέγχων αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός.[11] (Mat. xi. 27; Luke x. 22.)

Dial. c. 17. p. 235 C. Ἀύσχρηστος γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔδοξεν εἶναι, βοῶν παρ' ὑμῖν· Γέγραπται· Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς ἐστιν, ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν. Καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν ἐν τῷ ναῷ κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψε. (Mat. xxi. 13, especially Luke xix. 46.) *Καὶ ἐβόα· Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον, τὴν δὲ ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν κρίσιν οὐ κατανοεῖτε·* (Mat. xxiii. 23; Luke xi. 42.) *τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, ἔξωθεν φαινόμενοι ὡραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμοντες ὀστέων νεκρῶν.* (Mat. xxiii. 27.) *Καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν· Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς, ὅτι τὰς κλεῖς ἔχετε, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους κωλύετε·* (Luke xi. 52; Mat. xxiii. 14.) *ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί.* (Mat. xxiii. 16, 24.)[12] *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνέγνως, ὦ Τρύφων, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογήσας ἔφης, τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδαχθέντα, οὐκ ἄτοπον νομίζω πεποιηκέναι καὶ βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου λόγια πρὸς τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιμνησθείς.*[13]

Dial. c. 49. p. 268 C.[14] *Ὅστις ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν κα-*

[11] See also Apol. I. c. 63. p. 96 B, where the words are: Ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. See also Dial. c. 100. p. 326 D: Ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται εἰπών· Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός· καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. (See note on page 60.)

[12] This paragraph is strangely made up. The phrases are almost all from the Gospels, but they are not in the same order as in any Gospel. Justin quotes them again, but in a new order—again ending with the emphatic τυφλοὶ ὁδηγοί. This shows that he did not alter the order of our Gospels because of following some other one exemplar. We append the other passage for comparison: Dial. c. 112. p. 339 D: Τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, ἔξωθεν φαινόμενοι ὡραῖοι καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμοντες ὀστέων νεκρῶν, τὸν ἡδύοσμον ἀποδεκατοῦντες, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες· τυφλοὶ ὁδηγοί.

[13] This sentence is quoted because of the occurrence of the word λόγια.

[14] This occurs in Justin's reply to Trypho's objection that Elias must come before Christ; and that Elias has not come, so that Christ must be held as not

θεζόμενος ἐβόα· Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν· ἥξει δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. Οὗ τὸ πτύον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἅλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν σῖτον συνάξει εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ. Καὶ τοῦτον αὐτὸν τὸν προφήτην συνεκκλείκει ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν Ἡρώδης εἰς φυλακήν, καὶ γενεσίων ἡμέρας τελουμένης, ὀρχουμένης τῆς ἐξαδελφῆς αὐτοῦ εὐαρέστως αὐτῷ, εἶπεν αὐτῇ αἰτήσασθαι ὃ ἐὰν βούληται. Καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῆς παιδὸς ὑπέβαλεν αὐτῇ αἰτήσασθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· καὶ αἰτησάσης ἔπεμψε καὶ ἐπὶ πίνακι ἐνεχθῆναι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου ἐκέλευσε. Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς εἰρήκει ἐπὶ γῆς τότε τοῖς λέγουσι πρὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἠλίαν δεῖν ἐλθεῖν· Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται, καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι Ἠλίας ἤδη ἦλθε, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. Καὶ γέγραπται ὅτι Τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.[15] (Mat. iii. 11, 12; xiv. 3-11; xvii. 11-13.)

Dial. c. 76. p. 301 C. Ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. Καί· Πολλοί μοι ἐροῦσί μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν; Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς·

yet come. Justin, after asserting that *Zechariah* (compare c. 14, where he quotes Hosea as Zechariah) has predicted the coming of Elias, goes on to identify John Baptist with Elias. His argument is that the spirit of Elias coming in John was the forerunner of the first advent, and that Elijah will come as the forerunner of the second or glorious advent. He quotes our Lord's own teaching as referring back to the Baptist and forward to Elias. He is quoting from John Baptist when the extract begins.

[15] In this passage there is a change from the present tense (ἔρχεται Mark i. 7; Luke iii. 16, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστὶν Mat. iii. 11) into the future ἥξει δέ. So also in Dial. c. 88, Justin has ἥξει γάρ for the same passage. Justin's whole argument (which is not peculiar to him) may be founded on a mistaken interpretation so far as regards the second advent, but his adherence to the Gospels in his quotation is close. Clem. Alex. and Origen vary from the Evangelists more than Justin does. Though Justin alters ἔρχεται into a future (see the same in c. 35 as quoted before), he does no violence to the text. And in Mat. xvii. 11 the whole is made future by our Lord himself at the time of the Transfiguration: Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται πρῶτον καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, although he goes on to say ὅτι Ἠλίας ἤδη ἦλθε. See also below Dial. c. 88. 316 B. for a parallel to the whole passage.

Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ. Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις, οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναξίους μὴ σώζεσθαι μέλλει, ἔφη ἐρεῖν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.[16] (Mat. viii. 11, 12; compare Mat. vii. 22, 23; Luke xiii. 26.)

Dial. c. 77. p. 303 A. C. Ἅμα γὰρ τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀῤῥαβίας[17] *παραγενόμενοι, προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, πρότερον ἐλθόντες πρὸς Ἡρῴδην τὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν τότε βασιλεύοντα. . . . (c. 78.) Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης*[18]*, μαθὼν παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν, τότε ἐλθόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀῤῥαβίας μάγων, καὶ εἰπόντων, ἐξ ἀστέρος τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ φανέντος ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι βασιλεὺς γεγέννηται ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰπόντων, ὅτι γέγραπται ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ οὕτως· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου.*[19] *Τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀῤῥαβίας οὖν μάγων ἐλθόντων εἰς Βηθλεὲμ καὶ προσ-*

[16] See the same reference in Dial. c. 120 p. 349 B: Ἥξουσι γὰρ, εἶπεν, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. Dial. c. 140 p. 370 A: Καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν πατρὸς, καὶ δεσπότου τῶν ὅλων, οὐκ ἂν εἶπεν· Ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. See before Apol. I. c. 16. p. 63 D and note 8.

[17] Justin nine times says that the Magi came from Arabia (St Matthew says merely ἀπ᾽ ἀνατολῶν), and his references to them are so numerous that this must be regarded as his complete conviction. The facts, that Arabia is called "*the East*" in the O. T, Judges vi. 3; Job i. 3 (but see also for a wider reference Gen. xxix. 1; Num. xxiii. 7; Isaiah xlvi. 11), and that it produces the gifts which the Magi brought, may be the foundation of this view; which see also in Tertullian adv. Marc. III. 13, and Epiph. Haer. III. 80. On the other hand, Clem. Alex., Origen, Chrysostom, &c., say that they came from Persia or Chaldea.

[18] The sentence quoted in full is incomplete in Justin, there being no verb for Ἡρῴδης.

[19] This citation is from Micah v. 2, and is found also word for word in Apol. I. c. 34. Justin's words correspond much more closely with Mat. ii. 6 than with the LXX, where the passage runs thus: Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ οἶκος Ἐφραθὰ, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. There are other instances of Justin resembling Matthew's Gospel in citing the O. T. Thus in Apol. I. c. 35 he cites (as from *Zephaniah*) Zech. ix. 9, but except in the opening call he follows Mat. xxi. 5, not the LXX. (He quotes the same passage Dial. c. 53. p. 273 A with the right reference to Zechariah and more in accordance with the LXX.) So also in Dial. c. 17. p. 235 C he combines Isaiah lvi. 7 and Jeremiah vii. 11 as in Mat. xxi. 13; and the combination is too remarkable in itself to allow us to think the similarity accidental. See also the close of this extract.

κινησάντων τὸ παιδίον καὶ προσενεγκάντων αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν, ἐπειδὴ κατ᾽ ἀποκάλυψιν, μετὰ τὸ προσκυνῆσαι τὸν παῖδα ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, ἐκελεύσθησαν μὴ ἐπανελθεῖν πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην. Καὶ Ἰωσὴφ δὲ, ὁ τὴν Μαρίαν μεμνηστευμένος, βουληθεὶς πρότερον ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν μνηστὴν αὐτῷ Μαριὰμ, νομίζων ἐγκυμονεῖν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ συνουσίας ἀνδρὸς, τουτέστιν ἀπὸ πορνείας, δι᾽ ὁράματος κεκέλευστο μὴ ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ φανέντος ἀγγέλου ὅτι ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ὃ ἔχει κατὰ γαστρός ἐστι. (Compare Mat. ii. 1-12; i. 19, 20.) Φοβηθεὶς οὖν, οὐκ ἐκβέβληκεν αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ, ἀπογραφῆς οὔσης ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου (Luke ii. 2), ἀνεληλύθει ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ ἔνθα ᾤκει, εἰς Βηθλεὲμ, ὅθεν ἦν, ἀπογράψασθαι· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς κατοικούσης τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην φυλῆς Ἰούδα τὸ γένος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ κελεύεται ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ εἶναι ἐκεῖ ἅμα τῷ παιδίῳ, ἄχρις ἂν αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἀποκαλυφθῇ ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. (Compare Luke ii. 1-5;[20] Mat. ii. 13-15.) Γεννηθέντος δὲ τότε τοῦ παιδίου ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκείνῃ ποῦ καταλῦσαι, ἐν σπηλαίῳ[21] τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε· καὶ τότε, αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐκεῖ, ἐτετόκει ἡ Μαρία τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ αὐτὸν ἐτεθείκει· ὅπου ἐλθόντες οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγοι εὗρον αὐτόν. (Compare Luke ii. 7.) ... Καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης, μὴ ἐπανελθόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγων, ὡς ἠξίωσεν αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα αὐτοῖς δι᾽ ἄλλης ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν ἀπαλλαγέντων, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παιδίῳ, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκάλυπτο, ἤδη ἐξελθόντων εἰς Αἴγυπτον, οὐ γινώσκων τὸν παῖδα, ὃν ἐληλύθεισαν προσκυνῆσαι οἱ μάγοι, πάντας ἁπλῶς τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ ἐκέλευσεν ἀναιρεθῆναι. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐπεπροφήτευτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι διὰ Ἱερεμίου, εἰπόντος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως· Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ ἠκούσθη, κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολύς· Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.[22] (Compare Mat. ii. 18; Luke ii.)

[20] See note on Luke xxi.

[21] Early Christian tradition corroborates this statement that the place of the birth of Christ was a cave. The Protev. Jacobi and other Apocryphal Gospels have details; and Origen cont. Cels. c. 51 says: Δείκνυται τὸ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ σπήλαιον, ἔνθα ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ φάτνη, ἔνθα ἐσπαργανώθη.

[22] This closely resembles Mat. ii. 18 rather than the LXX (Jerem. xxxviii. 15) which runs thus: Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ ἠκούσθη θρήνου καὶ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ ὀδυρμοῦ· Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλαιομένη οὐκ ἤθελε παύσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.

Dial. c. 82. *p.* 308 *C.* Εἶπε γὰρ (ὁ Κύριος), ὅτι φονεύεσθαι καὶ μισεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέλλομεν, καὶ ὅτι ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ ψευδόχριστοι πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ παρελεύσονται καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι. (Compare Mat. xxiv. 5, 9, 24.)

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 316 *B.* Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου[23] ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ κηρύσσοντος βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην καὶ ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου μόνον φοροῦντος καὶ μηδὲν ἐσθίοντος πλὴν ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον, οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπελάμβανον αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν· πρὸς οὓς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος· ἥξει γὰρ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι. Καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ νομιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱοῦ ὑπάρχειν, καὶ ἀειδοῦς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκήρυσσον, φαινομένου, καὶ τέκτονος[24] νομιζομένου (ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὢν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγὰ, διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον), τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν τὸ ἅγιον καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὡς προέφην, ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς ἐπέπτη[25] αὐτῷ, καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἅμα ἐλήλυθει, ἥτις καὶ διὰ Δαυὶδ λεγομένη, ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅπερ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔμελλε λέγεσθαι·[26]

[23] Justin elsewhere also speaks of John "sitting" by the Jordan (Dial. cc. 49, 51). Evidently therefore this addition to the canonical narrative was in his opinion a historical fact. The other items of the opening description are canonical. See Mat. iii. 1; iv. 11; Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3, 15; John i. 20, 23.

[24] See Mark vi. 3. There Jesus is called a carpenter; but the description here of the work he did is additional. In the Gospel of Thomas (Greek A. C. XIII) ploughs and yokes are also stated to have been made by Jesus. There are in the Apocryphal Gospels many other details of miracles &c. connected with the opening years of Christ's manhood. In Origen's time—probably from mistaken pride—the reading in Mark seems to have omitted τέκτων; for Origen denies that Jesus is so called in the published Gospels. (Cont. Cels. VI. 36.)

[25] Ἐπέπτη. Justin does not use καταβαίνω, as all the canonical accounts do.

[26] The voice is said in another passage of the Dial. (c. 103. p. 331 B) to have used those words (which are a quotation from Ps. ii). In this passage it is not said that the memoirs are the authority. In the other passage the memoirs are not quoted for the voice, although they are quoted for other parts of the narrative. This form of the words addressed to our Lord is therefore an uncanonical addition. It must have been widely spread, being found in the Vetus Itala and in Cod. D; and in many of the early fathers (Clem. Alex., Lactantius, &c.). Augustine expressly says that it was the reading of some of the MSS of Luke iii. 22, though not of the earliest. The supposition that Justin in agreeing with a Jew thought to add weight to his argument by substituting a quotation from the Psalms for the canonical words, is both unnecessary and improbable. The version of Justin is in accordance with a very early tradition which probably arose from lapse of memory. Many Christians at this day would

Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε· τότε γένεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξότου ἡ γνῶσις αὐτοῦ ἔμελλε γίνεσθαι.

Dial. c. 93. p. 321 A. *Ὅθεν μοι δοκεῖ καλῶς εἰρῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην καὶ εὐσέβειαν πληροῦσθαι· εἰσὶ δὲ αὗται· Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.* (Mat. xxii. 37-39; compare Luke x. 27; Mark xii. 30.)

Dial. c. 99. p. 326 A. *Σταυρωθεὶς γὰρ εἶπεν, ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;* (Mat. xxvii. 46; compare Ps. xxii. 1.)

Dial. c. 99. p. 326 A. *Τῇ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ, ἧπερ ἔμελλε σταυροῦσθαι, τρεῖς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ παραλαβὼν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ λεγόμενον Ἐλαιὼν, παρακείμενον εὐθὺς τῷ ναῷ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ηὔχετο λέγων· Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο εὐχόμενος λέγει· Μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ θέλεις.* (Mat. xxvi. 39.)

Dial. c. 100. p. 327 A. *Ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ ἔφη, ὅτε περὶ τοῦ πάσχειν αὐτὸν μέλλειν διελέγετο, ὅτι Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι, ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι.*[27] (Mat. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22.) *Υἱὸν οὖν ἀνθρώπου ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγεν, ἤτοι ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τῆς διὰ παρθένου, ἥτις ἦν, ὡς ἔφην, ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαυὶδ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ γένους, ἢ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀδὰμ πατέρα καὶ*

give the same account as Justin; and the application of the words of the psalm to Jesus Christ in the New Testament (Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5) makes the mistake natural enough.

[27] For parallels see Dial. c. 51. p. 271 A: Λέγει ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι καὶ πάλιν παραγενήσεσθαι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τότε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ συμπιεῖν πάλιν καὶ συμφαγεῖν; and Dial. c. 76. p. 302 B: Ἐβόα γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ σταυρωθῆναι, δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πάλλα παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. We have Justin's usual freedom of citation exemplified in these extracts. It is noteworthy that where the Evv. have ἀποκτανθῆναι, Justin has σταυρωθῆναι. Irenaeus also has this word: Haer. III. 18. 4: *Ex eo enim, inquit, coepit demonstrare discentibus, quoniam oportet illum Hierosolymam ire et multa pati a sacerdotibus, et reprobari et crucifigi et tertia die resurgere.* (Compare Mark viii. 31 and Luke ix. 22, as well as Mat. xvi. 21, to which Irenaeus seems to refer the words.) Compare Luke xxiv. 7, where the same σταυρωθῆναι occurs. See σταυρῶσαι in Mat. xx. 18. See on the text Drummond in Theol. Rev. April, 1877, p. 180.

τούτων τῶν κατηριθμημένων, ἐξ ὧν κατάγει ἡ Μαρία τὸ γένος· καὶ γὰρ πατέρας τῶν γεννωμένων ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτῶν τέκνων τοὺς τῶν θηλειῶν γεννήτορας ἐπιστάμεθα. Καὶ γὰρ υἱὸν Θεοῦ, Χριστὸν, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐπιγνόντα αὐτὸν ἕνα τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Σίμωνα πρότερον καλούμενον, ἐπωνόμασε Πέτρον.[28] *Καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ γεγραμμένον αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες καὶ υἱὸν αὐτὸν λέγοντες νενοήκαμεν ὄντα καὶ πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προελθόντα, ὃς καὶ σοφία καὶ ἡμέρα καὶ ἀνατολὴ καὶ μάχαιρα καὶ λίθος καὶ ῥάβδος καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ κατ' ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον τρόπον ἐν τοῖς τῶν προφητῶν λόγοις προσηγόρευται, καὶ διὰ τῆς παρθένου ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι ἵνα καὶ δι' ἧς ὁδοῦ ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως παρακοὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε, διὰ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ κατάλυσιν λάβῃ.* (Mat. xvi. 16 &c.). See the same contrast or comparison, Iren. III. 22. § 4; VI. 19. § 1.

Dial. c. 102. *p.* 329 *C. Σιγήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ μηκέτι ἐπὶ Πιλάτου ἀποκρίνασθαι μηδὲν μηδενὶ βουλομένου, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ δεδήλωται.* (Mat. xxvii. 14.)

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 330 *C. Καὶ τὸ Ἤνοιξαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος δηλοῖ τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων τότε ὄντα, καὶ αὐτὸν Ἡρώδην λεγόμενον, διάδοχον γεγενημένον Ἡρώδου τοῦ, ὅτε ἐγεγέννητο, ἀνελόντος πάντας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ ἐκείνου τοῦ καιροῦ γεννηθέντας παῖδας, διὰ τὸ ὑπονοεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντως εἶναι τὸν περὶ οὗ εἰρήκεισαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀρραβίας ἐλθόντες μάγοι· μὴ ἐπιστάμενος τὴν τοῦ ἰσχυροτέρου πάντων βουλὴν, ὡς εἰς Αἴγυπτον τῷ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τῇ Μαρίᾳ ἐκπελεύκει ἀπαλλαγῆναι λαβοῦσι τὸ παιδίον, καὶ εἶναι ἐκεῖ ἄχρις ἂν πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἀποκαλυφθῇ ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν· κἀκεῖ ἦσαν ἀπελθόντες ἄχρις ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀποκτείνας τὰ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ παιδία Ἡρώδης.* (Compare Mat. ii.)

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *B.* See before, page 63.

Dial. c. 105. *p.* 333 *B.* See before, page 64.

Dial. c. 107. *p.* 334 *B.* See before, page 64, note 8.

Dial. c. 122. *p.* 350 *D. Ἡ γὰρ ἂν κἀκείνοις ἐμαρτύρει ὁ Χριστός· νῦν δὲ διπλότερον υἱοὶ γεέννης, ὡς αὐτὸς εἶπε, γίνεσθε.* (Mat. xxiii. 15.)

[28] See before, page 61, for another reference to this change of Peter's name, from Dial. c. 106. p. 333 D.

Dial. c. 125. *p.* 354 *B.* Ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς Κύριος εἶπεν· Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καλήν. (Mat. xiii. 3 &c.)

Dial. c. 125. *p.* 354 *D.* Ὅτε γὰρ ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὡς προεῖπον, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, τουτέστιν ἡ δύναμις ἐκείνη ἡ καὶ ὄφις κεκλημένη καὶ Σατανᾶς, πειράζων αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος καταβαλεῖν διὰ τοῦ ἀξιοῦν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν κατέλυσε καὶ κατέβαλεν, ἐλέγξας ὅτι πονηρός ἐστι, παρὰ τὴν γραφὴν ἀξιῶν προσκυνεῖσθαι ὡς Θεὸς, ἀποστάτης τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώμης γεγενημένος. Ἀποκρίνεται γὰρ αὐτῷ· Γέγραπται, Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις· καὶ ἡττημένος καὶ ἐληλεγμένος ἀπέπεσε τότε ὁ διάβολος.[29]

Justin Martyr. B. Citations not in our Gospels.

Dial. c. 35. *p.* 253 *B.*[1] Εἶπε γάρ· Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἔξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες. Καί· Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. Καί· Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἐλεύσονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἔξωθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες. Καί· Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. (Mat. vii. 15; xxiv. 5.)

[29] Citation from Deut. vi. 13 agreeing not with LXX but with St. Matthew. On this passage see before, page 63 note 5.

[1] The predictions of schism and heresies are not found in our Gospels. The quotations before and after this clause are from St. Matthew. Justin seems again to refer to this prediction, Dial. c. 57. The same reference may perhaps have been in Paul's mind, 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. The Clementine Homilies XVI. 2 combine the two predictions, ἔσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις φιλαρχίαι. Hegesippus (Eus. H. E. IV. 22) speaks of false Christs, false prophets, false apostles. So also Clem. Recog. IV. 34. The prediction of heresies is found also in Tertullian. The words are therefore found both before and after the time when the canonical Gospels had an exclusive place. Even a writer so late as Lactantius refers to the prediction of Heresies, whether from an apocryphal Gospel or only from oral tradition we have no means of deciding. To say that the source must be the Gospel of the Hebrews because Hegesippus made exclusive use of it, is to build too much on a narrow foundation. See Dial. c. 51. p. 271 B (below), and Dial. c. 82. p. 308 C for the same prophecy with the variations we might expect in Justin.

Dial. c. 47. *p.* 267 *A.*[2] *Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.*

Dial. c. 51. *p.* 271 *A. Χριστὸς καὶ αὐτὸς λέγων ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι, καὶ πάλιν παραγενήσεσθαι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τότε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ συμπιεῖν πάλιν καὶ συμφαγεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρόνῳ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσεσθαι ἱερεῖς καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε καὶ οὕτω φαίνεται ὄντα.*[3]

Dial. c. 69. *p.* 296 *A. Οἱ δὲ (Ἰουδαῖοι) καὶ ταῦτα (τὰ τέρατα) ὁρῶντες γινόμενα, φαντασίαν μαγικὴν γίνεσθαι ἔλεγον· καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον.*[4]

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 315 *D. Καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν, ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.*[5] (Compare Mat. iii. 13 &c.)

[2] Clem. Alex. has quoted the same passage or very nearly. His words are ἐφ' οἷς γὰρ ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ. In later times it was widely current, being attributed to Ezekiel or some other. It is argued that because Clement on another occasion has quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews therefore both Justin and he obtained this also from that Gospel. But while this is possible, it is only a hypothesis. See also Acts xx. 35, where we have a saying of our Lord preserved by tradition. May not this be an example of the same thing?

[3] This, in so far as it is not a quotation, seems to be a blending from memory of our Lord's predictions with the Gospel narrative.

[4] This is a perfectly justifiable allusion to the Jewish treatment of our Lord as working by the power of Beelzebub (Mat. ix. 34; xii. 24). Lactantius says that the Jews thought Christ a Magician, and grants that such an opinion might have been entertained had not the prophets predicted such things of the Messiah. In the Clem. Recog. we have allusions to the idea that Christ wrought by magic. And in the "Gospel of Nicodemus" the Jews before Pilate charge Jesus with being a magician.

[5] The construction here shows that the narrative of the kindling of a fire in the Jordan does not depend, as the reference to the descent of the Dove does, upon the testimony of the Apostles. The punctuation is disputed; but if we read ἀνήφθη, and there is no good reason for any other reading, the rules of construction separate the one clause from the other. The Apostles are therefore quoted only for the descent of the Spirit. In all the Gospels καταβαίνω describes the descent of the Spirit; here it is ἐπιπτῆναι; but the change is quite in Justin's manner. The passage occurs in course of an argument used by Justin to prove that the outward manifestations given to Christ did not make him the Christ, but only proved to men that He was the Christ. The mention of the fire is inci-

Dial. c. 106. *p.* 333 *C. Καὶ ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστι, τῶν ἀποστόλων οἵτινες . . . μετενόησαν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀφίστασθαι αὐτοῦ ὅτε ἐσταυρώθη, καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτῶν διάγων ὕμνησε τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων δηλοῦται γεγενημένον, τὰ λείποντα τοῦ ψαλμοῦ ἐδήλωσεν.* (See Ps. xxii. 22, 23).[6]

3. Letter to Diognetus.[1]

C. 9. *Περὶ ἐνδύσεως καὶ τροφῆς μὴ μεριμνᾶν.* (Mat. vi. 25-31.)

4. Hegesippus.[1]

Eus. H. E. III. 20. *Ἔτι δὲ περιῆσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, οὓς ἐδηλατόρευσαν, ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαβίδ. Τούτους δ᾽ ὁ Ἰουάκατος*[2] *ἤγαγε πρὸς Δομετιανὸν Καίσαρα· ἐφοβεῖτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης.*[3] (Mat. ii.)

Eus. H. E. II. 23. *Ἀκριβέστατά γε μὴν τὰ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡγήσιππος, ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς,*[4] *ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήματι τοῦτον λέγων ἱστορεῖ τὸν τρό-*

dental; but the argument admits of the speaker supplementing the canonical Gospels from other sources. There are many allusions to the fire in the apocryphal traditions of the early Church. According to Epiphanius the Ebionite Gospel said that when Jesus was *coming up* out of the water a great light shone about the place. A heretical Gospel called *Pauli Predicatio* refers to the fire, saying also that Jesus who acknowledged personal sin was constrained by his mother Mary to submit to John's Baptism. Although Justin therefore clearly supplements the canonical books: we cannot be sure of his source.

[6] The "Memoirs" are quoted here for our Lord's singing hymns with His brethren according to the prediction in the psalm. There is incidentally mention of all the disciples forsaking Him, when He was crucified, and it is explicitly stated elsewhere (Apol. I. c. 50. 86 B) that they forsook Him after He was crucified. But nothing more than rhetorical use, perhaps amplification, of the Gospel narrative can be made out against Justin. See Mat. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50; Luke xxiv. 13-33.

[1] Diognetus. See note p. 65.

[1] Hegesippus. See Introduction.

[2] Many various readings—Ἰκουβάτος, Ἰσυόκατος, Ἰουόκατος.

[3] This passage refers to the incident in Herod's history which we learn from Mat. ii. Epiphanius says that the Gospel of the Hebrews, as used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, did not contain the first two chapters of Matthew's Gospel. Hegesippus cannot therefore have used it as his authority here. See even Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. extra Can. Rec. Evang. sec. Hebraeos, p. 19).

[4] Rufinus translates thus: Hegesippus, qui post ipsas statim primas apostolorum successiones fuit; and Jerome seems to have the passage in view when he says *Vicimus Apostolorum temporum.* (De Vir. Ill. 22.)

πον. . . . καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο (Ἰάκωβος) φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· Τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κάθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . Ἀναβάντες οὖν κατέβαλον τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ ἔλεγον ἀλλήλοις· λιθάσωμεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον. Καὶ ἤρξαντο λιθάζειν αὐτὸν, ἐπεὶ καταβληθεὶς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ στραφεὶς ἔθηκε τὰ γόνατα λέγων· Παρακαλῶ, Κύριε Θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν. (Mat. xxii. 16; xxvi. 64; xxi. 9, 15; Luke xxiii. 34.)[5]

Eus. H. E. IV. 22. *Ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τίθησιν, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἑβραίων ἑαυτὸν πεπιστευκέναι.*[6]

Phot. Cod. 232 (9th cent.) *from Stephan Gobar* (6th cent.). *Ὅτι τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικὸς, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ,τι καὶ παθὼν, μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος· Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, καὶ ἑξῆς.*[7] (Mat. xiii. 16.)

[5] Hegesippus here reproduces the peculiar use of ἀφιέναι in the sense of 'to forgive' without an expressed object. There is no instance of this in the N. T. save in S. Luke. (See Sanday, Gospels in the Second Century, p. 143.)

[6] It seems most probable that Eusebius refers to the natural use made by Hegesippus of the Aramaic and the Hebrew Gospels, unless indeed these be the same thing. Lardner suggests that we have the true rendering undesignedly given by Jerome (adv. Pelag. III) *In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est.* (Lardner I. 357.)

[7] Hegesippus is here opposing the Gnostics, who founded much of the defence of their esoteric doctrine on this passage. Hegesippus possibly pleaded strongly—so strongly that Stephan could not understand him—the conclusion of St Paul (1 Cor. ii. 9) that these things, though beyond human reach, are revealed to Christians by God through His Spirit. The passage itself which Hegesippus has in view may be not St Paul's quotation, but Isaiah lxiv. 4; and he must be objecting to some application of it. [So Lightfoot, Galat. 2nd ed., p. 320.] But even apart from this, even if it is Paul's quotation which Hegesippus has in view, the argument he uses (μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα) may refer to the Gnostic application, not to the words of Paul. Without dwelling on a subject where want of information makes conjecture so easy and so insecure, we may say that the attempt (of Baur &c.) to make out Hegesippus an Ebionite is amazing, when Eusebius's description of him as a pillar of orthodoxy, and his own account of himself as refreshed by the common faith of the church in Corinth and elsewhere are kept in mind.

5. Tatian.

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 550. *Κατατρέχει δέ τις γενέσεως φθαρτὴν καὶ ἀπολλυμένην λέγων· καὶ βιάζεταί τις ἐπὶ τεκνοποιΐας λέγων εἰρηκέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα· Ἐπὶ γῆς μὴ θησαυρίζειν ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει.* (Mat. vi. 19; Luke xii. 33.)

Ibid. 551. *Ὁμοίως δὲ κἀκεῖνο κομίζουσι*[1] *τὸ ῥητὸν, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου, τὸ περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται.* (Mat. xxi. 30.)

6. Irenaeus.

[1] *Τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἐγράφη· οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπεθύμουν πάνυ σφόδρα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ Χριστόν. Ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον σφοδροτέραν ἔχων τὴν τοιαύτην ἐπιθυμίαν, παντοίως ἔσπευδε πληροφορίαν παρέχειν αὐτοῖς, ὡς εἴη ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ ὁ Χριστός· διὸ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἤρξατο.*

Adv. haeres. III. 9. § 1. Matthaeus enim apostolus, unum et eundem sciens Deum, qui promissionem fecerit Abrahae, facturum se semen ejus quasi stellas coeli, qui per filium suum Christum Jesum a lapidum cultura in suam nos agnitionem vocaverit, uti fieret, "qui non populus, populus; et non dilecta, dilecta;" ait Joannem praeparantem Christo viam, his qui in carnali quidem cognatione gloriabantur, varium autem et omni malitia completum sensum habebant, eam poenitentiam, quae a malitia revocaret, annuntiantem dixisse: "Progenies viperarum, quis vobis monstravit fugere ab ira ventura? Facite ergo fructum dignum poenitentiae. Et nolite dicere in vobis ipsis: Patrem habemus Abraham: dico enim vobis, quoniam potens est Deus ex lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae." (Mat. iii. 7 &c.) Poenitentiam igitur eis eam, quae esset a malitia, praeconabat, sed non alterum Deum annuntiabat, praeter eum qui fecisset promissionem Abrahae, ille praecursor Christi; de quo iterum ait Matthaeus, similiter autem et Lucas: "Hic enim est qui dictus est

[1] The Encratites.

[1] From Possini Catena Patrum in Matthaeum (Stieren, I. 842).

a Domino per prophetam: vox clamantis in deserto, Parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas Dei nostri. Omnis vallis implebitur, et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur, et erunt tortuosa in directa, et aspera in vias planas: et videbit omnis caro salutare Dei." (Mat. iii. 3; Luke iii. 4 &c.)

B. III. 9. § 2. 3. Iterum autem de Angelo dicens Matthaeus, ait: "Angelus Domini apparuit Joseph in somnis." Cujus Domini, ipse interpretatur: "Uti adimpleatur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam: Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum. Ecce virgo in utero accipiet, et pariet filium, et vocabunt nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod est interpretatum: Nobiscum Deus." De hoc, qui est ex virgine Emmanuel, dixit David: "Non avertas faciem Christi tui. Juravit Dominus David veritatem, et non spernet[2] eum, de fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam." (Ps. cxxxi. 10, 11.) Et iterum: "Notus in Judaea Deus, et factus est in pace locus ejus, et habitaculum ejus in Sion." (Ps. lxxv. 2.) Unus igitur et idem Deus, qui a prophetis praedicatus est, et ab evangelio[3] annuntiatus, et hujus filius qui ex fructu ventris David, id est, ex David virgine, et Emmanuel: cujus et stellam Balaam quidem sic prophetavit: "Orietur stella ex Jacob, et surget dux in Israel." (Num. xxiv. 15.) Matthaeus autem Magos ab Oriente venientes ait dixisse: "Vidimus enim stellam ejus in Oriente, et venimus adorare eum:" deductosque a stella in domum Jacob ad Emmanuel, per ea quae obtulerunt munera ostendisse, quis erat qui adorabatur: myrrham quidem, quod ipse erat, qui pro mortali humano genere moreretur et sepeliretur: aurum vero, quoniam Rex, "cujus regni finis non est;" thus vero, quoniam Deus, qui et notus in Judaea factus est, et manifestus eis, qui non quaerebant eum. Adhuc ait in baptismate Matthaeus: "Aperti sunt ei coeli, et vidit Spiritum Dei, quasi columbam venientem super eum. Et ecce vox de coelo, dicens: Hic est filius meus, in quo mihi bene complacui."

III. 16. § 2. Sed et Matthaeus unum et eumdem Jesum Christum cognoscens, eam quae est secundum hominem generationem ejus ex virgine exponens, sicut promisit Deus David, ex fructu ventris ejus excitaturum se aeternum regem, multo prius

[2] Or dispernet.
[3] Or Ab angelo.

Abrahae eandem faciens promissionem, ait: "Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham." Dehinc ut liberaret mentem nostram a suspicione, quae est circa Joseph, ait: "Christi autem generatio sic erat. Cum esset desponsata mater ejus Joseph, priusquam convenirent, inventa est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto." Dehinc cum Joseph cogitaret dimittere Mariam, quoniam praegnans erat, adsistentem ei angelum Dei, dicentem: "Ne timueris assumere Mariam conjugem tuam: quod enim habet in utero, de Spiritu Sancto est. Pariet autem filium, et vocabis nomen ejus Jesum: hic enim salvabit populum suum a peccatis suis. Hoc autem factum est, ut impleretur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam: Ecce virgo accipiet in utero, et pariet filium, et vocabunt nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod est, Nobiscum Deus;" manifeste significans, et eam promissionem, quae fuerat ad patres, impletam, ex virgine natum filium Dei, et hunc ipsum esse salvatorem Christum, quem prophetae praedicaverunt: non sicut ipsi dicunt, Jesum quidem ipsum esse, qui ex Maria sit natus, Christum vero qui desuper descendit.

7. Athenagoras.[1]

Legatio, c. 1. *Οὐ μόνον μὴ ἀντιπαίειν, οὐδὲ μὴν δικάζεσθαι τοῖς ἄγουσι καὶ ἁρπάζουσιν ἡμᾶς μεμαθηκότες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν, κἂν κατὰ κόρρης προσπηλακίζωσι, καὶ τὸ ἕτερον παίειν παρέχειν τῆς κεφαλῆς μέρος, τοῖς δὲ, εἰ τὸν χιτῶνα ἀφαιροῖντο, ἐπιδιδόναι καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον.* (Mat. v. 39, 40.)

Ibid. c. 11. *Ἐπεὶ καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν δογμάτων οἷς προσέχομεν, οὐκ ἀνθρωπικοῖς οἴσιν, ἀλλὰ θεοφάτοις καὶ θεοδιδάκτοις, πεῖσαι ὑμᾶς, μὴ ὡς περὶ ἀθέων ἔχειν, δυνάμεθα. Τίνες οὖν ἡμῶν οἱ λόγοι οἷς ἐντρεφόμεθα; Λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν*

[1] Athenagoras, "an Athenian, a philosopher, and a Christian," presented his Apology (perhaps in person, for its title is πρεσβεία, embassy) to "the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus," in the year A.D. 176 or 177. Such, at least, seems to be the most probable account. As the extracts show, his object was to vindicate the personal character of Christians; and being, as his style shows, a man who could justly claim to be both philosopher and Christian, he was well fitted to prevail upon the imperial philosopher to regard the disciples of Jesus Christ with favour. He was naturally led to quote the Sermon on the Mount.

διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὃς τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. (Mat. v. 44, 45.)

Ibid. c. 12. Μέχρι τοσούτου δὲ φιλανθρωπότατοι ὥστε μὴ μόνον στέργειν τοὺς φίλους, (Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπᾶτε, φησὶ, τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας καὶ δανείζετε τοῖς δανείζουσιν ὑμῖν, τίνα μισθὸν ἔξετε;) τοιοῦτοι δὲ ἡμεῖς ὄντες καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον βιοῦντες βίον, ἵνα κριθῆναι διαφύγωμεν, ἀπιστούμεθα θεοσεβεῖν; Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μικρὰ ἀπὸ μεγάλων καὶ ὀλίγα ἀπὸ πολλῶν, ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὑμῖν ἐνοχλοίημεν. (Mat. v. 46, 47.)

Ibid. c. 32. Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος τῇ θυγατρὶ κατὰ χρησμὸν ἐμίγη, βασιλεῦσαι ἐθέλων καὶ ἐκδικηθῆναι. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοσοῦτον ἀδιάφοροι εἶναι ἀπέχομεν, ὡς μηδὲ ἰδεῖν ἡμῖν πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἐξεῖναι. Ὁ γὰρ βλέπων, φησὶ, γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἤδη μεμοίχευκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. (Mat. v. 28.)

8. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. III. 13-14. Ἡ δὲ εὐαγγέλιος φωνὴ ἐπιτατικώτερον διδάσκει περὶ ἁγνείας λέγουσα· Πᾶς ὁ ἰδὼν γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ὁ γαμῶν, φησὶν, ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μοιχεύει, καὶ ὃς ἀπολύει γυναῖκα παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι. Ἔτι ὁ Σολομῶν φησί· Ἀποδήσει τις πῦρ ἐν ἱματίῳ, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ οὐ κατακαύσει; ἢ περιπατήσει τις ἐπ᾽ ἀνθράκων πυρὸς, τοὺς δὲ πόδας οὐ κατακαύσει; Οὕτως ὁ εἰσπορευόμενος πρὸς γυναῖκα ὕπανδρον οὐκ ἀθῳωθήσεται. Καὶ τοῦ μὴ μόνον ἡμᾶς εὐνοεῖν τοῖς ὁμοφύλοις, ὡς οἴονταί τινες, Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης ἔφη· Εἴπατε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ τοῖς βδελυσσομένοις, Ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν ἔστε, ἵνα τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου δοξασθῇ καὶ ὀφθῇ ἐν τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ αὐτῶν. Τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον· Ἀγαπᾶτε, φησὶ, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπᾶτε τοῦς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποῖον μισθὸν ἔχετε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ λῃσταὶ, καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσι. Τοὺς δὲ ποιοῦντας τὸ ἀγαθὸν διδάσκει μὴ καυχᾶσθαι, ἵνα μὴ ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ὦσιν. Μὴ γνώτω γὰρ, φησὶν, ἡ χείρ σου ἡ ἀριστερὰ, τί ποιεῖ ἡ χείρ σου ἡ δεξιά. (Mat. v. 28, 32, 44, 46; vi. 3.)

9. Pantaenus.

Eus. H. E. V. 10.[1] Ἦγεῖτο δὲ τηνικαῦτα τῆς τῶν πιστῶν αὐτόθι διατριβῆς ἀνὴρ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐπιδοξότατος, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Πάνταινος, ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς συνεστῶτος, ὃ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς παρατείνεται, καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ θεῖα σπουδῇ δυνατῶν συγκροτεῖσθαι παρειλήφαμεν. Ἦν δὲ τοῖς μάλιστα κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ διαλάμψαι λόγος ἔχει τὸν δεδηλωμένον, οἷα καὶ ἀπὸ φιλοσόφου ἀγωγῆς τῶν καλουμένων Στοϊκῶν ὡρμωμένον. Τοσαύτην δ᾽ οὖν φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐκθυμοτάτῃ διαθέσει προθυμίαν περὶ τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἐνδείξασθαι, ὡς καὶ κήρυκα τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν εὐαγγελίου τοῖς ἐπ᾽ ἀνατολῆς ἔθνεσιν ἀναδειχθῆναι, μέχρι τῆς Ἰνδῶν στειλάμενον γῆς. Ἦσαν γὰρ εἰσέτι τότε πλείους εὐαγγελισταὶ τοῦ λόγου, ἔνθεον ζῆλον ἀποστολικοῦ μιμήματος συνεισφέρειν ἐπ᾽ αὐξήσει καὶ οἰκοδομῇ τοῦ θείου λόγου προμηθούμενοι. Ὧν εἷς γενόμενος καὶ ὁ Πάνταινος, καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· ἔνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρά τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν, οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕνα κηρῦξαι αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφὴν, ἣν καὶ σώζεσθαι εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον χρόνον. Ὅ γε μὴν Πάνταινος ἐπὶ πολλοῖς κατορθώμασι, τοῦ κατ᾽ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τελευτῶν ἡγεῖται διδασκαλείου, ζώσῃ φωνῇ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τοὺς τῶν θείων δογμάτων θησαυροὺς ὑπομνηματιζόμενος.

Hieronym. script. eccl. c. 36. (Pantaenus in India) reperit, Bartholomaeum de duodecim apostolis adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi juxta Matthaei evangelium praedicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum revertens Alexandriam secum retulit.

[1] This testimony is valuable as being independent of that of Papias and those who follow him. By India it is supposed that Southern Arabia is denoted. Pantaenus flourished in the end of the second century, and was the teacher of Clem. Alex. Eusebius has been speaking of the first year of the reign of Commodus (c. 9), and it was at that date (A.D. 192) therefore that, according to him, Pantaenus was the head of the Alexandrian School. There is difficulty in understanding what is meant by τελευτῶν in the last sentence of our extract, because Clement succeeded Pantaenus about A.D. 189. Was Pantaenus twice at the head of the School, before and after his missionary tour?

10. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. I. 409. *Ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίῳ ἡ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ γενεαλογία μέχρι Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου περαιοῦται· γίνονται γάρ, φησὶν, ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἕως Δαβὶδ γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμοίως ἄλλαι γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες.*

11. Tertullian.

Adv. Marcion. V. 9. Nos edimus evangelia (de quorum fide aliquid utique jam in tanto opere istos confirmasse debemus) nocturna nativitate declarantia Dominum, ut hoc sit ante luciferum, et ex stella Magis intellecta, et ex testimonio angeli, qui nocte pastoribus annuntiavit natum esse cum maxime Christum, et ex loco partus, in diversorium enim ad noctem convenitur. Fortasse an et mystice factum sit ut nocte Christus nasceretur, lux veritatis futurus ignorantiae tenebris.

De carne Christi, c. 20. Sed bene, quod idem dicit Matthaeus originem Domini decurrens ab Abraham usque ad Mariam, "Jacob," inquit, "generavit Joseph, virum Mariae, ex qua nascitur Christus."

Ibid. c. 22. Ipse inprimis Matthaeus, fidelissimus evangelii commentator, ut comes Domini, non aliam ob causam, quam ut nos originis Christi carnalis compotes faceret, ita exorsus est: "Liber geniturae Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham."

12. The Clementine Homilies.[1]

Hom. III. 52.[2] *Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ἔτι συνεσιώτων*

[1] Although the Clementine Homilies are more largely quoted afterwards when the relation of Heretics and of Judaeo-Christian sects to the Church falls to be considered, there are some references given here in order that the catena of Testimonies may be more complete. For a discussion of the place and influence of the *Clementines* see Introduction. The Latin form of the Christian Romance —the Recognitions—seems on many grounds to be less valuable for our purpose than that from which we quote—the Homilies.

[2] In this passage are instances of verbatim agreement (Mat. xi. 28), almost complete agreement (Mat. xv. 13; John x. 27) and of an echo of a passage in the Gospel (John x. 9). The whole is a specimen of the style of the Homily.

παρῆλθον θυσίαι, βασιλεῖαι, αἱ ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν προφητεῖαι, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, ὡς οὐκ ὄντα Θεοῦ προστάγματα, ἔνθεν γοῦν λέγει· Πᾶσα φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκριζωθήσεται (Mat. xv. 13). *Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθὴς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν· Ἐγώ εἰμὶ ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δι' ἐμοῦ εἰσερχόμενος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν ζωὴν* (John x. 9), *ὡς οὐκ οἴσης ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας. Διὸ καὶ ἐβόα λέγων· Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες* (Mat. xi. 28) *τουτέστιν οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦντες καὶ μὴ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν· καὶ πάλιν· Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς* (John x. 27). *Καὶ ἄλλοτε· Ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρίσκετε* (Mat. vii. 7) *ὡς μὴ προδήλως κειμένης τῆς ἀληθείας.*

Hom. VIII. 4. *Ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοί, φησίν, κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.* (Mat. xx. 16.)[3]

Hom. XVIII. 15. *Καὶ ὁ Σίμων ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀγανακτήσας ἔφη· Τὸν σὸν διδάσκαλον αἰτιῶ εἰπόντα· Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἅπερ ἦν κρυπτὰ σοφοῖς, ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις θηλάζουσιν . . . ἐνδέχεται γὰρ αὐτοῦ εἶναι τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἃ ἔλεγεν, τῷ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν εἰπεῖν· Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ ἐξερεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* (Mat. xi. 25; xiii. 35).

Hom. XIX. 2. *Καὶ ἄλλη που οἶδα αὐτὸν εἰρηκότα· Εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη, πῶς οὖν αὐτοῦ στήσῃ ἡ βασιλεία;* (Mat. xii. 20) . . . *Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ συμβουλεύων εἴρηκεν· Ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναί, ναί, καὶ τὸ οὔ, οὔ· Τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.* (Mat. v. 37; Jas. v. 12.) *Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ᾗ παρέδωκεν εὐχῇ ἔχομεν εἰρημένον· Ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.* (Mat. vi. 13; xii. 26.) *Καὶ ἄλλη που εἰπεῖν ὑπέσχετο τοῖς ἀσεβοῦσιν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.* (Compare Mat. xxv. 30; xxii. 13; viii. 12.)

Hom. XIX. 7. *Οὕτω γὰρ ὁ ἀψευδὴς ἡμῶν εἶπε διδάσκαλος· Ἐκ περισσεύματος καρδίας στόμα λαλεῖ.* (Mat. xii. 34.)

[3] See before, page 102, note 3.

13. Origen.

(See before, pp. 8, 51, 81.)

De Orat. Tom. I. p. 245. (Migne, vol. I. p. 509.) *Πρῶτον δὲ τοῦτ' ἰστέον, ὅτι ἡ λέξις ἡ ἐπιούσιον, παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὠνόμασται, οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται, ἀλλ' ἔοικε πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν. Συνηνέχθησαν γοῦν ὁ Ματθαῖος καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς περὶ αὐτῆς μηδαμῶς διαφερούσης, αὐτὴν ἐξενηνοχότες. Τὸ ὅμοιον δὲ καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλων οἱ ἑρμηνεύοντες τὰ Ἑβραϊκὰ πεποιήκασι.*

Comm. in Mat. Tom. 15. *c.* 13. *p.* 670. (Migne, vol. III. p. 1290.) *Πρόσχες οὖν εἰ δυνάμεθα πρὸς τὴν προκειμένην ζήτησιν καθ' ἕνα μὲν τρόπον οὕτως ἀπαντῆσαι, ὅτι μήποτε τό· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σαυτόν, ὑπονοεῖσθαι δύναται, ὡς οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐνταῦθα παρειλῆφθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπό τινος τὴν ἀκρίβειαν μὴ νοήσαντος τῶν λεγομένων, προστεθεῖσθαι. . . . Καὶ εἰ μὲν μὴ καὶ περὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν διαφωνία ἦν πρὸς ἄλληλα τῶν ἀντιγράφων, ὥστε πάντα τὰ κατὰ Ματθαῖον μὴ συνᾴδειν ἀλλήλοις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ Εὐαγγέλια, κἂν ἀσεβής τις ἔδοξεν εἶναι ὁ ὑπονοῶν ἐνταῦθα προσερρῖφθαι, οὐκ εἰρημένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος πρὸς τὸν πλούσιον τὴν Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, ἐντολήν· νυνὶ δὲ δηλονότι πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορὰ, εἴτε ἀπὸ ῥᾳθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων. Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, Θεοῦ διδόντος, εὕρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν· τῶν γὰρ ἀμφιβαλλομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφωνίαν, τὴν κρίσιν ποιησάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων, τὸ συνᾴδον ἐκείναις ἐφυλάξαμεν, καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν· τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν, ἵνα δῆλον ᾖ, ὅτι μὴ κείμενα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκδόσεων συμφώνως τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ προσεθήκαμεν· καὶ ὁ μὲν βουλόμενος πρόηται αὐτά· ᾧ δὲ προσκόπτει τὸ τοιοῦτον, ὃ βούλεται περὶ τῆς παραδοχῆς αὐτῶν, ἵ' μὴ, ποιήσῃ.*[1]

[1] Origen here recounts the causes of difference in the copies of the Gospels

Comm. in Joh. Tom. IV. p. 132. (Migne, vol. IV. p. 253.) Ἔχοντες τοίνυν τὰς ὁμοίας λέξεις τῶν τεσσάρων, φέρε κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἴδωμεν ἰδίᾳ τὸν νοῦν ἑκάστης καὶ τὰς διαφοράς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Ματθαίου, ὃς καὶ παραδέδοται πρῶτος τῶν λοιπῶν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐκδεδωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύουσιν.[2]

Comm. in Joh. Tom. IV. p. 136. (Migne, vol. IV. p. 262.) Ὁ τοίνυν Ἰωάννης φησὶ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς τρισὶν οὐκ εἶναι ἱκανὸς, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ οὐκ εἶναι ἄξιος.[3]

14. Julius Africanus.[1]

Eus. H. E. I. 7. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὴν περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίαν διαφόρως ἡμῖν ὅ τε Ματθαῖος καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμενοι παραδεδώκασι, διαφωνεῖν τε νομίζονται τοῖς πολλοῖς, τῶν τε πιστῶν ἕκαστος ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς εὑρησιλογεῖν εἰς τοὺς τόπους πεφιλοτίμηται, φέρε καὶ τὴν περὶ τούτων κατελθοῦσαν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἱστορίαν παραθώμεθα, ἣν δι' ἐπιστολῆς Ἀριστείδῃ, γρά-

He is even bold enough to suggest that the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," may not be genuine, inasmuch as they are not in Mark or Luke. The chief significance of his words lies in the fact of so many divergences in MSS of the New Testament in his day. It shows that the Books had been in circulation for a long time before. See also Origen, Comm. in Rom. IV. 687 and below. The testimony of Irenaeus is still more notable from the same point of view (Book V. 30. 1), for at his earlier date the same phenomena of conflicting manuscripts were seen. See Scrivener, Int. to Textual Crit., p. 449 for examination of those facts. Origen says elsewhere (c. Cels. II. p. 77) that he "did not know any that had altered the text of the Gospels designedly except the followers of Marcion and Valentinus and perhaps also of Lucanus."

[2] This passage says that Matthew wrote for Hebrews. In a passage preserved by Eus. H. E. VI. 25 (see before, page 8) he says that the Gospel was γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον. He repeats the statement in our text in his Com. in Joh. I. 6 (see before, p. 85). It is remarkable, however, that Origen never makes any use of the said Hebrew original of Matthew. See his remarks on the New Testament renderings of Hebrew (Acts xiii. 33) in the fragments left by him on Psalms ii and iii. (Migne, vol. VI. P. 1. p. 575, &c.)

[3] This occurs in the course of his minute comparison of the narrative of the Evangelists regarding John the Baptist.

[1] Julius Africanus, a contemporary of Origen, lived in Palestine, is said to have been Bishop of Emmaus. Author of a Chronographia from the Creation to A.D. 221, which Eusebius and others quote. The following extract is from his letter to Aristides, notable as an attempt to explain the discrepancy in the Genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The attempt implies the acceptance of both at the time he wrote. There is a remarkable correspondence between the extract as given by Eusebius and the Hortatory Address to the Greeks which is ascribed to Justin Martyr.

φων περὶ συμφωνίας τῆς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις γενεαλογίας ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν δηλωθεὶς Ἀφρικανὸς ἐμνημόνευσε, τὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν λοιπῶν δόξας ὡσὰν βιαίους καὶ διεψευσμένας ἀπελέγξας, ἣν δὲ αὐτὸς παρείληφεν ἱστορίαν, τούτοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐκτιθέμενός·

Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν γενῶν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἠριθμεῖτο ἢ φύσει ἢ νόμῳ, φύσει μὲν, γνησίου σπέρματος διαδοχῇ, νόμῳ δὲ, ἑτέρου παιδοποιουμένου εἰς ὄνομα τελευτήσαντος ἀδελφοῦ ἀτέκνου· (ὅτι γὰρ οὐδέπω δέδοτο ἐλπὶς ἀναστάσεως σαφὴς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀναστάσει ἐμιμοῦντο θνητῇ, ἵνα ἀνέκλειπτον τὸ ὄνομα μείνῃ τοῦ μετηλαχότος)· ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ ταύτῃ ἐμφερόμενοι, οἱ μὲν διεδέξαντο παῖς πατέρα γνησίως, οἱ δὲ ἑτέροις μὲν ἐγεννήθησαν, ἑτέροις δὲ προσετέθησαν κλήσει, ἀμφοτέρων γέγονεν ἡ μνήμη, καὶ τῶν γεγεννηκότων, καὶ τῶν ὡς γεγεννηκότων. Οὕτως οὐδέτερον τῶν εὐαγγελίων ψεύδεται, καὶ φύσιν ἀριθμοῦν καὶ νόμον· ἐπεπλάκει γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὰ γένη, τό τε ἀπὸ τοῦ Σολόμωνος, καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ Νάθαν, ἀναστάσεσιν ἀτέκνων, καὶ δευτερογαμίαις καὶ ἀναστάσεσι σπερμάτων, ὡς δικαίως τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἄλλοτε ἄλλων νομίζεσθαι, τῶν μὲν δοκούντων πατέρων, τῶν δὲ ὑπαρχόντων· ὡς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς διηγήσεις κυρίως ἀληθεῖς οὔσας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ πολυπλόκως μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς κατελθεῖν. Ἵνα δὲ σαφὲς ᾖ τὸ λεγόμενον, τὴν ἐπαλλαγὴν τῶν γενῶν διηγήσομαι κ.τ.λ.

Hieron. de Vir. Ill. c. 63. Extat ejus ad Aristidem altera epistola, in qua super *διαφωνία*, quae videtur esse in genealogia Salvatoris apud Matthaeum et Lucam, plenissime disputat.

15. Eusebius.

(See before, p. 10, 87, &c.)

Com. in Psalm. lxxvii. 2. (Migne, V. 904.) *Ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ· Φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Ἑβραῖος ὢν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκείᾳ ἐκδόσει κέχρηται, εἰπών· Ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς, ἀνθ' οὗ ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας· Ὁμβρήσω αἰνίγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆθεν, ἐκδέδωκεν· ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος· Ἀναβλύσω προβλήματα ἀρχαῖα.*[1]

[1] There may be doubt as to what οἰκεία ἔκδοσις means. It is clear that Eusebius means at least to intimate Matthew's independence of the translations of Symmachus and Aquila. If we can suppose Matthew to have been the translator of his own Gospel from Hebrew into Greek, this passage may be reconciled

H. E. III. 24. *Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ*[2] *γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, τούτοις ἀφ' ὧν ἐστέλλετο, διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἀπεπλήρου.*

16. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. XIV. p. 148. (edit. Paris. 1640). *Ματθαῖος ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Ἑβραΐδι γλώσσῃ τοῦτο ἔγραψεν.*

17. Epiphanius.

Haeres. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. (t. 1. p. 127). *Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον, τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρινθον χρῶνται μόνῳ. Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα.*

Ibid. (p. 425). *Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Ματθαῖος καταξιοῦται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ δικαιότατα ἦν.*

Haeres. II. t. 1. *h.* 51. (t. 1. p. 426). *Καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κηρύττει, καὶ ἄρχεται οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ διηγεῖται μὲν τὴν γενεαλογίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ.*

18. Jerome.[1]

De Vir. Ill. c. 3. Matthaeus, qui et Levi, ex publicano Apostolus, primus in Judaea propter eos qui ex circumcisione cre-

with the others in which Eusebius declares him to have written his Gospel in Hebrew. Compare Eus. H. E. III. 24 (see before, p. 87, where the whole passage is given). See also H. E. V. 10 (before, p. 110).

[2] See the context before, p. 110, extract from Eus. H. E. V. 10; and compare p. 87, H. E. III. 24.

[1] On the various and varying testimonies of Jerome to the original form of Matthew's Gospel see Introduction, 'Gospel of the Hebrews,' and see the passages quoted in our text below, 'Gospel of Hebrews.' It is remarkable that he does not claim to have used it in making his own version: "Novum Testamentum Graecae fidei reddidi. Vetus juxta Hebraicam retuli." (De vir. ill. c. 135.) He says elsewhere that he translated into Greek the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which is called by many the authentic Gospel of Matthew; he says

diderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit. Quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea, urbe Syriae, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit. In quo animadvertendum, quod ubicumque Evangelista, sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris, Veteris Scripturae testimoniis abutitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem, sed Hebraicam, e quibus illa duo sunt: *Ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum* (Mat. ii. 15), et: "*Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur* (Mat. iii. 23)."

Praefat. in IV Evang. ad Damasum (Vol. X. p. 661.) De Novo nunc loquor Testamento, quod Graecum esse non dubium est, excepto apostolo Matthaeo, qui primus in Judaea evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis edidit.

Prolegom. in Matth. (Vol. VII. p. 3.) Primus omnium Matthaeus est publicanus cognomento Levi, qui Evangelium in Judaea Hebraeo sermone edidit, ob eorum vel maxime causam, qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judaeis, et nequaquam Legis umbram, succedente evangelii veritate, servabant.

Epist. (XX) ad Damas. (Vol. I. p. 67.) Matthaeus, qui evangelium Hebraeo sermone conscripsit, ita posuit OSANNA BARRAMA id est Osanna in excelsis etc.

Ad Hedib. (Vol. I. p. 820.) Mihi videtur evangelistam Matthaeum, qui evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam "vespere" dixisse quam "sero," et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non "sero" interpretatum esse, sed "vespere."[2]

Comment. in Iesaiam (Vol. III. p. 97.) Matthaeus autem et Joannes, quorum alter Hebraeo, alter Graeco sermone evangelia texuerunt, testimonia de Hebraico proferunt etc.

Comment. in Oseam cap. XI. 1. (Vol. VI. p. 123.) Cui nos breviter respondebimus: primum Matthaeum evangelium Hebraeis literis edidisse, quod non poterant legere nisi qui ex Hebraeis erant.

here that he was allowed an opportunity of examining and taking notes from that copy which was in the Pamphilus library at Cesarea. The references here are to the Edition of Vallarsius 1734-42 (11 vols.).

[2] Jerome is answering a question (No. 4) regarding the accounts of the Resurrection in Matthew and John.

VII.

GOSPEL OF MARK.

(COMPARE SECTIONS IV. AND V.)

1. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. *Περὶ Μάρκου . . . ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου κ.τ.λ.* (see before pp. 56, 57 and notes there).[1]

[1] Early tradition consistently maintains a close connection between Mark's Gospel and the Apostle Peter. From Papias downwards the testimony is clear. He is said by Papias to have been the ἑρμηνευτής, by Irenaeus to have been *interpres et sectator*, of Peter. Jerome gives a very concrete meaning to the word ἑρμηνευτής, when he says that as Paul needed an interpreter to furnish him with suitable Greek, and employed Titus in that capacity, so also Peter needed and employed Mark. See the more general references to him as interpreter and follower of Peter in the quotations in our text from Papias, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. But whatever was the special relation denoted by ἑρμηνευτής, it is admitted to have been intimate. The expression in 1 Peter v. 13, Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου, is supposed to indicate it. The tradition also is that "Babylon," of which Peter speaks in the same epistle, was Rome; although it has been supposed in later times that Peter wrote from the literal Babylon, to which he had gone with Mark for his companion. Mark is said to have been the founder and first Bishop of the Church in Alexandria; and Jerome says, he suffered martyrdom in the eighth year of Nero. (Hieron. de Vir. Ill. c. 8.) There is also such warrant as tradition can give for identifying him with the John Mark of whom we read in Acts xii. 12, that he was the son of Mary who had a house in Jerusalem where brethren assembled for prayer. To this house Peter went direct when set free from prison. We read of "John surnamed Mark" going with Barnabas and Saul on their missionary journey (Acts xii. 25), and of (apparently the same) John being the minister (ὑπηρέτης) of those Apostles (Acts xiii. 5) until he turned back from them at Perga (Acts xiii. 13). This "John surnamed Mark" was the cause of dissension between the two Apostles after the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 37). Under the name of Mark we have him (Coloss. iv. 10) joined in Paul's salutations as the kinsman (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas, with a peculiar and significant reference to certain directions which had been given for his proper reception and treatment. The reference may be supposed to intimate that the Colossians were to regard him as one whose present devotedness to Paul atoned for his past defection. He is also joined in the salutation (Philem. 24). In the last letter of Paul he is longed for as "very useful for service" (2 Tim. iv. 11). This close alliance of John Mark with Paul has led some to distinguish between him and the author of the Gospel and "interpreter" of Peter. Hippolytus (in a fragment on the 70 Apostles) even distinguishes three: the Evangelist (Bishop of Alexandria), the cousin of Barnabas (Bishop of Apollonia), and John Mark (Bishop of Biblounolis). But ordinary tradition leads us to believe that the same person—the Evangelist—was the companion and helper of Barnabas and Paul and Peter. A later tradition makes him one of the 70 disciples (Pseudo-Origen, *De recta in Deum fide*, § 1),

Ibid. Ἱστορεῖ (sc. *Παπίας*) καὶ ἄν πάλιν ἕτερον παράδοξον περὶ Ἰούστον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Βαρσαββᾶν γεγονὸς, ὡς δηλητήριον φάρμακον ἐμπιόντος καὶ μηδὲν ἀηδὲς διὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου χάριν ὑπομείναντος.[2] (Mark xvi. 18.) (See before page 56, line 5.)

2. Barnabas. Clement. Hermas.

Barnabas, c. 15. 9. Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς.[1] (Mark xvi. 14.)

1 *Clem.* 15. Λέγει γάρ που· Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με

and Epiphanius (Haer. 51. 6) adds that he was one of those who "went away" from Jesus (John vi. 66) until Peter brought him back. In our own day it is usual to identify him with the "young man" who first impulsively followed Jesus at the end, and with equal impulsiveness fled away. The quotations from Clement of Alexandria and Origen and Tertullian give with varying details the same testimony to the close connection between Peter and Mark's Gospel. His Gospel shows that he wrote to Gentiles who were familiar with Latin words (vi. 27; xii. 42, &c.) and who needed explanations of Jewish customs (ii. 18; vii. 1-4; xiv. 14; xv. 6, &c.). Gregory of Nazianzum says, the Gospel was written in Italy (which agrees with the oldest tradition), but Chrysostom says it was written in Egypt. Augustine contradicts the statements as to Mark's Gospel being a written record of Peter's preaching when he says that Mark came after Matthew as one who abridged him and trode in his very footsteps. But when the reason is given that Mark has little in common with John and very little peculiar to himself, Augustine is overlooking the remarkable fulness of graphic detail which distinguishes Mark from Matthew even when the same incidents are recorded. (Aug. de consensu Evangelistarum, I. 4.)

[2] Barsabas, as Eusebius states in next sentence (see p. 56), is named in Acts i. 23 as "Joseph called Barsabas." Possibly the words in the text are a slip for Ἰωσὴφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν. There may be in this passage a reference to the promise in Mark; but there is no parallel use of words, and the mere statement that an early disciple took poison without being harmed does not afford much ground for the argument that its author had the passage of St Mark in view.

[1] See before, page 104, note 8. Though Reuss, Gesch. § 234, quotes it to show that it contradicts both Matthew and Mark, Hilg. sees in it a contradiction of Matthew alone, adding however that Luke xxiv. 40 contradicts Acts i. 3. The question is whether the Ascension of Jesus is here regarded as taking place immediately after the Resurrection. But neither from Mark nor Luke is this a necessary inference. The condensed narrative of Mark allows of an interval before *v.* 14 and again before *v.* 19. Luke xxiv. 51 must be taken along with Acts i. 3, where the author speaks of forty days of intercourse and teaching, although in his earlier narrative there seems at first sight no room for such an interval. In the same way Barnabas may be understood as declaring that each of the two events took place on the eighth day, with an indefinite time between. That "the Ascension was regarded as the consummation of the Resurrection without regard to the interval between them" (Speaker's Com.), scarcely vindicates the historical accuracy of the Evangelists.

τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.[2] (Is. xxix. 13; Mark vii. 6.)

Hermas, Mand. I. 1. *Sim. IX.* 25.[3]

3. Justin Martyr.

Apol. I. c. 16. *p.* 63 *D.* *Ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, οὕτως ἔπεισεν εἰπών· "Μεγίστη ἐντολή ἐστι, Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε."*[1] (Mark xii. 30.)

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 316 *C.* *Καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ νομιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱοῦ ὑπάρχειν* (Luke iii. 23; Mat. xiii. 55) . . . *καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου (ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγὰ, διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον)* . . . (Mark vi. 3.)[2]

Dial. c. 106. *p.* 333 *D.* *Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφοὺς, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας, μετωνομακέναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργὲς, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς, σημαντικὸν ἦν τοῦ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον εἶναι, δι' οὗ καὶ τὸ ἐπώνυμον Ἰακὼβ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπικληθέντι ἐδόθη.* (Mark iii. 17.)[3]

[2] The quotation resembles Mark rather than the LXX. Hilg. reads ἀπέχει.

[3] These passages are not given at length, because they do not seem to be of sufficient importance.

[1] Justin, like Mark, has ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, and so also has Luke x. 27. But the coincidence is not verbal, since Justin (both here and Dial. c. 93. p. 321 A) has only ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας . . . ἰσχύος, while Mark has also ψυχῆς . . . διανοίας. Luke has the same nouns as Mark, but with ἐν not ἐξ in the best MSS for all save καρδίας. The Scribe in his reply does not repeat the same words, *v.* 33.

[2] Mark alone calls Christ a carpenter. The Apocryphal Gospels (see Ev. Thom. c. 13 &c.) expand the fact into details as Justin does. There is in Orig. c. Cels. VI. 36 a strange denial that our Gospels ever call Christ τέκτων. Celsus had stated that he was τέκτων τὴν τέχνην.

[3] Justin's phrase ἀπομ. αὐτοῦ is without a parallel in his writings (see Introduction on 'Justin's Memoirs'). If it be retained, we must suppose him to refer to Peter (in which case he confirms the tradition that Mark's Gospel represents Peter's preaching), or to Christ. Otto supposes that (1) αὐτοῦ is a mistake for αὐτῶν, and gives many examples of a similar confusion of singular and plural genitives in MSS of Justin; or (2) ἀποστόλων has been omitted before αὐτοῦ. In the latter case the passage would be parallel to that in c. 100 already quoted

The following passages bear on the disputed verses at the close of Mark's Gospel, c. xvi. 9-20.[4]

Apol. I. c. 39. *p.* 78 *A.* Ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἄνδρες δεκαδύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ οὗτοι ἰδιῶται, λαλεῖν μὴ δυνάμενοι· διὰ δὲ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἐμήνυσαν παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἀπεστάλησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάξαι πάντας τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον. (Mark xvi. 20.)

Apol. I. c. 45. *p.* 82 *E.* Τὸ οὖν εἰρημένον· "Ῥάβδον δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ σοι ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ" προαγγελτικὸν τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, ὃν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν. (Mark xvi. 20.)

Apol. I. c. 49. *p.* 85 *A.* Οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξελθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. (Mark xvi. 20.)

Apol. I. c. 50. *p.* 86 *A.* Μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν . . . καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες (Luke xxiv. 49) καὶ δύναμιν ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες καὶ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ἐλθόντες, ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν καὶ ἀπόστολοι προσηγορεύθησαν. (See Mark xvi. 19; John xv. 26, 27.)

Dial. c. 32. *p.* 249 *E.* Ὅπερ γίνεται ἐξ ὅτου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν

in which is recorded the change of Peter's name. (Mat. xvi. 18, but emphatically Mark iii. 16.) These however are mere conjectures, and, as the passage stands, ἀπομνημονεύματα αὐτοῦ naturally mean Peter's Memoirs, which, however elliptical, is expressive enough. The reference of αὐτοῦ to Christ is contrary to the usages of Justin, who designates the authors in the genitive following ἀπομνημονεύματα.

[4] Although it is not easy to show that Justin had Mark's Gospel specially in view when quoting or referring to the Memoirs, or when narrating the events of Christ's life, the foregoing are beyond dispute references to Mark's Gospel, and those which follow refer to our Lord's Ascension and the enduing of the disciples with power, in terms which sometimes suggest Luke and sometimes Mark as the source from which they are taken. For a discussion of the genuineness of the close of the Gospel after ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ see Burgon on "the Last Twelve Verses of St Mark." The ascension to heaven of which Justin often speaks cannot have been learned from Matthew's Gospel. It is to be noted however that Justin often uses ἀνέρχομαι and other words, while the word in Scripture is ἀναλαμβάνω. As Tisch. N. T. p. 407 and Burgon p. 25 refer to this, I may refer to all the passages (besides Apol. I. c. 50, quoted in the text): Apol. I. c. 26, ἀνέλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Apol. I. c. 26; Dial. c. 39, εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν ἀνέλευσιν. But Dial. c. 82, ἄνοδον τὴν εἰς οὐρανόν. See Apol. c. 45, ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν ὁ πατήρ. In Dial. c. 32 we have ἀνηλήφθη; c. 38, ἀναβεβηκέναι, c. 85 ἀναβάντος, c. 126, ἀναβάντα. In Dial. c. 132 the words are ἀνεληλυθότα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς. The only use of ἀναλαμβάνω I can find is that in Dial. c. 32 (see Text).

ἀνελήφθη μετὰ τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός κ.τ.λ.

Dial. c. 53. *p.* 273 *C. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ διεσκεδάσθησαν, μέχρις ὅτου ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ πέπεικεν αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὕτως προεπεφήτευτο περὶ αὐτοῦ παθεῖν αὐτόν·* (Luke xxiv. 25, 44, 46) *καὶ οὕτω πεισθέντες καὶ εἰς τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην ἐξελθόντες ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν.* (Mark xvi. 20.)

4. Irenaeus.

B. III. 1. (See before, p. 67, and note there.)

B. III. 10, 6. Quapropter et Marcus interpres et sectator Petri, initium evangelicae conscriptionis fecit sic: "Initium Evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quemadmodum scriptum est in Prophetis: Ecce, mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, qui praeparabit viam tuam. Vox clamantis in deserto: Parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas ante Deum nostrum." . . . In fine autem Evangelii ait Marcus: "Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in coelos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei." (Mark i. 1; xvi. 19.)[1]

B. III. 11, 7. Qui autem Jesum separant a Christo, et impassibilem perseverasse Christum, passum vero Jesum dicunt, id quod secundum Marcum est praeferentes Evangelium; cum amore veritatis legentes illud, corrigi possunt.[2] (See before, page 67.)

[1] In Harl. MS 5647 (= Evan. 72) the scholium against Mark xvi. 19 is Εἰρηναῖος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πλησίον, ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις γ΄ λόγῳ τοῦτο ἀνήνεγκεν τὸ ῥητὸν ὡς Μάρκῳ εἰρημένον. See Burgon's St Mark, p. 23.

[2] It is uncertain to what sect Irenaeus refers here. Some (Grabe &c.) say Cerinthus and his followers. But Epiphanius says that they, as well as the Ebionites, used only Matthew's Gospel. Baur and others (following De Wette) think Mark xv. 37, 39 a text on which Gnostics would found, because the Centurion was convinced of Jesus being the Son of God by the loud cry with which the Spirit (that had been with Him) left Him on the cross. They quote Mark i. 26; v. 7; ix. 26 in proof that this Gospel regarded a loud cry as the proof of a supernatural spirit leaving a human body. But while Schwegler regarded the Gospel as Ebionite, Hilg. (Einl. 520) only speaks of "Gnostics" (without specifying which sect) who would be conciliated by such a passage as Mark xv. 37. In his "Evangelien Justins" (p. 281) Hilg. followed De Wette in calling the passage Doketic.

5. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 33. Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται· οὔτε ἀπολύειν ἐπιτρέπων ἧς ἔπαυσέ τις τὴν παρθενίαν, οὔτε ἐπιγαμεῖν. Ὁ γὰρ ἀποστερῶν ἑαυτὸν τῆς προτέρας γυναικὸς, καὶ εἰ τέθνηκε, μοιχός ἐστι παρακεκαλυμμένος, παραβαίνων μὲν τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς ἕνα ἄνδρα ἔπλασε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα. Λύων δὲ τὴν σαρκὸς πρὸς σάρκα κατὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν πρόσμιξιν εἰς τοῦ γένους κοινωνίαν. (Mark x. 11, 6; compare Mat. xix. 4, 9; Luke xvi. 16, 18.)

6. Muratorian Canon.

(See before, p. 5.)

7. Clement of Alexandria.

Eus. H. E. II. 15. Οὕτω δὴ οὖν ἐπιδημήσαντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ θείου λόγου ἡ μὲν τοῦ Σίμωνος ἀπέσβη καὶ παραχρῆμα σὺν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλέλυτο δύναμις, τοσοῦτο δ' ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοίαις εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἱκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ, μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρῆσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι, ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. Ἰνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθέν φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ, κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, (Κλήμης ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων παρατέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, μαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπίας), τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν, τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα διὰ τούτων· "Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου."

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. *Τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν κ.τ.λ.* (see before, p. 75).[1]

Clem. Alex. Adumb. in Pet. p. 1007. "Salutat vos Marcus filius meus" (v. 13). Marcus, Petri sectator, palam praedicante Petro evangelium Romae, coram quibusdam Caesareanis equitibus, et multa Christi testimonia proferente; penitus (petitus) ab eis ut possent quae dicebantur memoriae commendare, scripsit ex his, quae a Petro dicta sunt, Evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur. Sicut Lucas quoque et Actus Apostolorum stylo executus agnosceret et Pauli ad Hebraeos interpretatus epistolam.

8. Hippolytus.

Hippol. Cont. Haer. Noeti (Routh's Opuscula, I. 80). *Ἀναλαμβάνεται* [sc. *Χριστὸς*] *εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐκ δεξιῶν πατρὸς καθίζεται καὶ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν παραγίνεται κρίτης.* (Mark xvi. 19.)

Hippol. (*περὶ χαρισμάτων*, Opp. p. 545). *Ἰησοῦς φησὶ πᾶσιν ἅμα, περὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος διδομένων χαρισμάτων· Σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσι· γλώσσαις καιναῖς λαλήσουσιν· ὄφεις ἀροῦσι· κἂν θανάσιμόν τί πίωσιν, οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψει· ἐπὶ ἀῤῥώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσι, καὶ καλῶς ἕξουσι.* (Mark xvi. 17.)

Hippol. εἰς τὰ ἅγια Θεοφάνεια (Lagarde's Hippolytus, p. 38). *Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι, αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.* (Mark i. 7, 8.)

Hippol. Ref. Omnium Haeresium VII. 30. *Ἐπειδὰν οὖν Μαρκίων ἢ τῶν ἐκείνου κυνῶν τις ὑλακτῇ κατὰ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀντιπαραθέσεως ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ προφέρων λόγους, δεῖ*

[1] See before, pages 67, 75, and notes. Clement's two traditions preserved by Eusebius: the one (H. E. II. 15) that Peter sanctioned the Gospel, and the other (H. E. VI. 14) that he was aware of its existence, but neither forbade nor encouraged its publication, are inconsistent with each other and with the distinct statement of Irenaeus III. 1 (see page 67 and note) that Mark gave his Gospel to the Church μετὰ τὴν τούτων (sc. τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου) ἔξοδον. The proposed reading in Irenaeus is: μετὰ τὴν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου ἔκδοσιν, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς κ.τ.λ. which gets over the difficulty, but somewhat violently.

αὐτοῖς λέγειν, ὅτι τούτους οὔτε Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, οὔτε Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος ἀνήγγειλαν, (τούτων γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται) κ.τ.λ.[1]

9. Tertullian.

Adv. Marcion. IV. 5. Marcus quod edidit evangelium, Petri affirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus.[1] Nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent.

10. Origen.

(See before, pp. 8, 52, 82, 85.)

11. Clementine Homilies.

(See Introduction for discussion. For passages in full, see next part of this work.)

The following references may meanwhile be compared:

Hom. II. 19 (Mark vii. 25-30; Mat. xv. 28). *Hom. III.* 54 (Mark x. 5, 6; Mat. xix. 8). *Hom. III.* 55 (Mark xii. 27; Mat. xxii. 32; Luke xx. 38). *Hom. III.* 57 (Mark xii. 29). *Hom. XIX.* 20 (Mark iv. 34).

[1] In the preface to the Gospel of Mark ascribed to Jerome in the Cod. Amiatinus it is said of Mark: *Denique amputasse sibi post fidem pollicem dicitur, ut sacerdotio reprobus haberetur.* The same statement is found in an Arabic MS described by Fleischer: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig 1854, vol. VIII. p. 586. So far as this goes, it is in accordance with the statement (Col. iv. 10) that Mark was ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα. If Mark was of Levitical extraction, the amputation of his thumb may have been his device to escape official duty in the temple. Duncker (see Duncker's Hippol. p. 393, note) supposes that Hippolytus wished to allude to the mutilated Gospel used by Marcion, and wrongly ascribed it to Mark. But this is unlikely: and is inconsistent with the text itself as given above, for the reference is not to Marcion's Gospel but to the actual Gospel of Mark.

[1] See before, page 80, for the whole passage. Tertullian seeks to establish the apostolic basis of the Gospels. Two were written by Apostles; the other two were mediately, if not immediately, of Apostolic authority. The chief interest of this extract is that *Interpres* is evidently the translation of ἑρμηνευτής; so also Jerome.

12. Eusebius.

(See before, pp. 10, 87, &c.)

Chronicon ad A. 2 et 3. Claud. Petrus apostolus natione Ga-

lilaeus, Christianorum pontifex primus, cum primum Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romam proficiscitur, ubi Evangelium praedicans 25 annis ejusdem urbis episcopus perseverat. Marcus evangelista interpres Petri, Aegypto et Alexandriae Christum annuntiat.

Demonstr. Evang. III. 5. *Πέτρος οὐδὲ καθῆκεν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐαγγελίου γραφὴν, δι' εὐλαβείας ὑπερβολήν. Τούτου Μάρκος γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονὼς ἀπομνημονεῦσαι λέγεται τὰς τοῦ Πέτρου περὶ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διαλέξεις. . . . Πέτρος δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖ· πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τοῦ Πέτρου διαλέξεων εἶναι λέγεται ἀπομνημονεύματα.*

H. E. II. 16. *Τοῦτον δὲ Μάρκον πρῶτον φασὶν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου στειλάμενον, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ δὴ καὶ συνεγράψατο κηρύξαι, ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας συστήσασθαι.*

13. Epiphanius.

Haeres. II. c. 1. *h.* 51. *p.* 428. *Εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον, ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν.*

14. Jerome.

(See before, pp. 21, 100, &c.)

De Vir. Ill. c. 1. Sed et Evangelium juxta Marcum, qui auditor ejus (sc. Petri) et interpres fuit, hujus dicitur.

De Vir. Ill. c. 8. Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romae a fratribus, breve scripsit Evangelium. Quod cum Petrus audisset, probavit; et Ecclesiis legendum sua auctoritate edidit, sicut Clemens in sexto ὑποτυπώσεων libro scribit. Et Papias Hierapolitanus episcopus meminit hujus Marci; et Petrus in epistola prima, sub nomine Babylonis figuraliter Romam significans: "Salutat vos quae in Babylone coelecta,[1] et Marcus filius meus." Assumto

[1] Al. cum electa, collecta.

itaque Evangelio quod ipse confecerat, perrexit Aegyptum, et primus Alexandriae Christum annuntians, constituit ecclesiam, tanta doctrina et vitae continentia, ut omnes sectatores Christi ad exemplum sui cogeret. Denique Philo disertissimus Judaeorum, videns Alexandriae primam ecclesiam adhuc judaizantem, quasi in laudem gentis suae librum super eorum conversatione scripsit. Et quomodo Lucas narrat, Jerosolymae credentes omnia habuisse communia: sic et ille quod Alexandriae sub Marco fieri doctore cernebat, memoriae tradidit. Mortuus est autem octavo Neronis anno, et sepultus Alexandriae, succedente sibi Aniano.

Ep. ad Hedib. c. 2. Divinorum sensuum majestatem digno non poterat (B. Paulus) Graeci eloquii explicare sermone; habebat ergo Titum interpretem sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum cujus Evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est.

---

15. Special Testimonies to close of the Gospel.

The evidence on the genuineness of the disputed passage Mark xvi. 9-20 may be here summed up:[1]

Papias (Eus. H. E. III. 39) Ἱστορεῖ (sc. *Παπίας*) *κ.τ.λ.* (see before, page 137 and note 2).

[1] The genuineness of this passage was disputed by Griesbach, and subsequent Editors have followed him. Tisch. (eighth edition) sums up the evidence with his usual clearness and succinctness. He prefixes "Haec non a Marco scripta esse argumentis probatur idoneis." The *Manuscript Evidence* against the verses is that ℵ omits them; B omits them, but leaves a blank column which would have contained them, the scribe being apparently uncertain whether or not to put them in (it is the only blank column in the whole volume); L (which usually follows B) closes a column with εφοβουντο γαρ and then at the top of the next column includes in flourishes φερετε που και ταυτα . . . after which it adds Παντα δε τα παρηγγελμενα τοις περι τον πετρον συντομως εξηγγιλαν † μετα δε ταυτα και αυτος ο ις απο ανατολης και αχρι δυσεως εξαπιστιλεν δι αυτων το ιερον και αφθαρτον κηρυγμα † της αιωνιου σωτηριας †. And then, inclosed in further flourishes, the scribe says εστην δε και ταυτα φερομενα μετα το εφοβουντο γαρ (see Burgon's Photograph, p. 112). This is all the MS evidence against the verses, save that some minor Codices of the Armenian and Aethiopic and one of the Old Latin (k) are on the same side. We may say therefore that ℵ and B omit the verses (the latter with some qualms); and that L has a view of its own. *All other* MSS (including ACD) contain the verses; as do the Peshito, Cur. and Jerus. Syriac, the Philoxenian text, the Sahidic, Memphitic, and Aethiopic, the Vulgate, all extant Old Latin MSS except the one (k) mentioned above. There is therefore an immense preponderance of authority in MSS and versions in favour of the

Barnabas, c. 15. 9 *Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν κ.τ.λ.* (see before, page 137 and note 1).

Justin Martyr, Apol. I. cc. 39, 45, 49, 50; Dial. cc. 32, 53 (see before, page 145 and note 1).

Irenaeus, B. III. 10. 6: In fine autem Evangelii &c. (see before, page 147 and note 1).

Hippolytus contra Noet. and *περὶ χαρ.* (see before, page 142 and note 1).

Vincentius of Thibari (at Concil. Carth. VII A.D. 256): Habemus regulam veritatis quam Dominus praecepto divino mandavit Apostolis dicens: *Ite in nomine meo manum imponite, daemonia expellite.* (Mark xvi. 17, 18.)

Gesta Pilati, c. 14 (Evang. Nicod. Pars I. A) *Ἔλεγεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει· ὁ πιστεύσας κ.τ.λ.* (Verbatim from the N. T. to *καλῶς ἕξουσιν.*) Then it goes on *Ἔτι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἴδομεν αὐτὸν ἀναληφθέντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.* (Mark xvi. 15-18.)

Apost. Constt. VII. 7. *Λαβόντες ἐντολὴν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον.* VIII. 1. *Ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις μέλλουσιν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλειν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει.*

Euseb. ad Marinum (Mai. 1847; Burgon p. 265.) In answer to the first question put to him by Marinus: *Πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ*

verses. As regards the evidence of *quotation by the Fathers* it will be seen from our extracts that in the second century (omitting Papias) Barnabas and Justin seem to found upon the verses. Irenaeus certainly does. In the third century Hippolytus (A.D. 190 to 227), the Acts of Pilate, seventh Council of Carthage and Apost. Constt. (?) also use them. In the fourth century Eusebius throws doubt upon them; and Jerome subsequently (as his custom is in many things) reproduces what Eusebius said, but in his own work as an Editor of the Bible recognizes and admits the verses. The only adverse testimony which we really have therefore is that of Eusebius (if indeed he were not reproducing for the sake of discussion some earlier writer). Eusebius and ℵ, with the halfhearted support of B, make a serious opposition to the genuineness of the verses; but they cannot overcome the solid mass of testimony in its favour. Olshausen (followed by Alford, &c.) supposes that in some old copy a leaf was torn off or lost; and, if Tischendorf be right in ascribing this part of ℵ to the scribe who wrote B, we have an easy explanation of the testimony of these two MSS, as he would have that defective exemplar before him when making both copies. But apart from conjecture as to this, it may be admitted that Dean Burgon has justified his boast that "S. Mark's last Twelve Verses shall no longer remain a subject of dispute among men." (Dedication p. vi.) His book is a wonderful proof of concentrated industry.

Ματθαίῳ ὄψε σαββάτων φαίνεται ἐγεγερμένος ὁ Σωτὴρ, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρωῒ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων. Eusebius says: *Τούτου διττὴ ἂν εἴη ἡ λύσις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσαν περικοπὴν ἀθετῶν, εἴποι ἂν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἱστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὀφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ εἰρηκότος αὐταῖς· "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνόν." Καὶ τοῖς ἑξῆς οἷς ἐπιλέγει· "Καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ." Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου περιγέγραπται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἑξῆς σπανίως ἔν τισιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι φερόμενα περιττὰ ἂν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἴποι ἄν τις παραιτούμενος καὶ πάντη ἀναιρῶν περιττὸν ἐρώτημα κ.τ.λ.*[2]

[3] *Hieron. Epist. Hedib. quaest.* 3. on Mark xvi. 9-20. (Opp. t. III, p. 172.) Quae causa sit, ut de resurrectione . . . evangelistae diversa narraverint. . . . Hujus quaestionis duplex solutio est. Aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur Evangeliis: omnibus Graeciae libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus: praesertim cum diversa atque contraria evangelistis caeteris narrare videatur. Aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque verum dixerit.

Hieron. Dial. II. adv. Pelagianos, § 15. In quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in Graecis codicibus, juxta Marcum in fine

[2] Eusebius goes on to intimate that another man who could not take it upon him to reject what he finds in the Gospels, might admit both readings; and after some confusing (and, as it stands, confused) reasoning, he says in answer to a second question by Marinus that ὀψὲ σαββάτων in Matthew's narrative ought not to be understood as meaning the 'Evening of the Sabbath day,' but an advanced period of the following night; and he thus makes out the narrative of Matthew to be consistent with that of John, which says that Mary came on the first day of the week while it was yet dark. Mark is identical with John, and in his answer to Marinus's second question Eusebius gives an easy solution. Burgon suggests that in answer to the first question Eusebius was reporting the opinion of some one else.

[3] Burgon points out that the question and answer ascribed to Hedibia and Jerome are in fact translations of what passed between Eusebius and Marinus, so that we have not Jerome's own view in this passage. This is clear even in our extracts (see extract above from Euseb. ad Marin., with note). In revising the Old Latin version of the New Testament, Jerome allowed the verses to remain at the end of Mark's Gospel.

ejus Evangelii scribitur: "Postea quum accubuissent undecim, apparuit eis Jesus: et exprobravit incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum, quia his qui viderant eum resurgentem, non crediderunt: et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia est, quae non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem: idcirco jam nunc revela justitiam tuam."

VIII.

GOSPEL OF LUKE.[1]

(SEE BEFORE, SECTIONS I—V.)

1. Barnabas.

C. 14. 1. *Ναί. Ἀλλὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ὤμοσεν τοῖς πατράσι δοῦναι τῷ λαῷ, εἰ δέδωκεν ζητῶμεν.* (Luke i. 73.)

[1] That the author of the third Gospel was also the author of Acts may be regarded as certain. The tone and style, as well as the express claim (Acts i. 1), are accepted as decisive. Schleiermacher's breaking up of the whole narrative of the Gospel into its constituent parts has borne much fruit—not as regards this Gospel only—throughout this century, and his disciples are found in every land. But nothing more is proved than Luke's own preface implies. The Book is an avowed compilation of the testimonies of ministers and eyewitnesses. And, compilation though it be, there are marks of unity of authorship throughout. The phraseology of the two books is strikingly similar, and affords a demonstration that they are the work of a single author. On this Zeller (Acts, vol. II. p. 213, &c. Engl. Trans.) may answer Schleiermacher, whose Essay on St Luke is well known through Thirlwall's translation. (See also Schleiermacher, Einleitung, § 56 to § 79 and [for Acts] § 85 to § 90.) (See below, p. 159 note 1.) There is also an elaborate account of Luke's vocabulary in Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evang. § 19. 9. The physician, the man of culture, and the man acquainted with seafaring, though not a sailor, is seen in both works. In regard to this last point see Smith (of Jordanhill), Dissertation on the Life and Writings of St Luke, prefixed to his 'Voyage and Shipwreck of St Paul' (1866). The first two chapters have been regarded by some as not genuine, but there can be no doubt that Justin Martyr knew them, and there seems to be an echo of them in Clement and Barnabas. Marcion's Gospel is now admitted to have been later than Luke, and to have been an adaptation of it, by mutilation. Though Tertullian's zeal leads him to charge Marcion with corruption in some passages where it is now clear that Marcion preserved the reading of older MSS of Luke than those in Tertullian's hand, the assurance of the African Apologist that Marcion's book was a mutilation of Luke is confirmed by recent investigations. The author of 'Supernatural Religion' stands out as a solitary opponent in the mean time; but he has a special regard for Marcion, whom he thinks "too able a man" (Sup. Rel. II. 125) to have done his work so imperfectly as to lay it open to the well-founded objections of Tertullian and others! This may be regarded as an expression of sympathy, but can scarcely be considered an argument.

That Luke was Paul's close companion we know from the writings of both. See below, notes on extracts from Irenaeus, Eusebius, and Jerome. That his Gospel represented teaching similar to that of St Paul, can scarcely be doubted; and, where they touch the same great subject, as in the account of the Lord's Supper, their words so closely correspond that the coincidence cannot be accidental. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen all associate Paul with the Gospel of his friend and follower. But Luke's own Preface seems to be adequate reply to all such fond imaginings. It is hard to believe that if Luke had the direct authority of Paul for his narration, he would have failed to claim that authority in his

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.

C. 13. 2. (see before, Section V).

C. 46. 8. (see before, Section V).

C. 59. 3. *Τὸν ταπεινοῦντα ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων, τὸν διαλύοντα λογισμοὺς ἐθνῶν, τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος καὶ τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς ταπεινοῦντα·* (Luke i. 52.[1])

Second Epistle.

C. 2. 7. *Οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠθέλησεν σῶσαι τὰ ἀπολλύμενα καὶ ἔσωσεν πολλούς, ἐλθὼν καὶ καλέσας ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἀπολλυμένους.* (Luke xix. 10, and 1 Tim. i. 15.)

C. 6. 1, 2. *Λέγει δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν. Ἐὰν ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν καὶ Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ ἀσύμφορον ἡμῖν ἐστίν.* (Luke xvi. 13; Mat. vi. 24.)

C. 8. 5.[2] *Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν.* (Luke xvi. 10, 12.)

3. Hermas.

Mand. V. 2. 7. *Εἶτα ὅταν ἀποστῇ* [sc. *τὸ πνεῦμα*] *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου οὗ κατοικεῖ, γίνεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ-*

preface. But it is equally hard to believe that a Gospel written by Luke in Paul's life-time should be published without the sanction of the great Apostle whose spirit it breathes, and whose very words it uses. We need not adopt the "Tendency" theory, as though the book were a conscious compromise between contending parties, or a fiction intended to teach Paulinism, when we agree with Hilgenfeld that we have in the Third Gospel an antidote to Judaism proper and to Judaizing Christianity, and a manifestation of the same truth of righteousness by faith and that faith the work of the Holy Spirit as Paul teaches. (Hilgenfeld, Die Evv., p. 220-223.)

[1] The whole of the first part of the prayer from which this is taken is like a paraphrase of the Virgin's hymn in Luke's Gospel.

[2] This is one of the many passages in 2 Clem. which may be referred to an apocryphal source; but it is perhaps sufficiently near to the words in Luke's Gospel to be cited in our text. Iren. II. 34. 3 has "si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod magnum est quis dabit vobis?"

νος κενὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ λοιπὸν πεπληρωμένος τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς πονηροῖς ἀκαταστατεῖ ἐν πάσῃ πράξει αὐτοῦ, περισπώμενος ὧδε κἀκεῖσε ἀπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν πονηρῶν, καὶ ὅλως ἀποτυφλοῦται ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας τῆς ἀγαθῆς. (Luke xi. 24-26.)

4. Protevangelium Jacobi.[1]

C. 17. *Κέλευσις δὲ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου βασιλέως ἀπογράφεσθαι πάντας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας κ.τ.λ.*

5. Justin Martyr.[1]

Apol. I. c. 16. *p.* 63 *B. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνεξικάκους εἶναι καὶ ὑπηρετικοὺς πᾶσι καὶ ἀοργήτους ἃ ἔφη ταῦτά ἐστιν· Τῷ τύπτοντί σου τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ τὸν αἴροντά σου τὸν χιτῶνα, ἢ τὸ ἱμάτιον, μὴ κωλύσῃς.* (Luke vi. 29; compare Mat. v. 39, 40.)

Apol. I. c. 17. *p.* 64 *E. Ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμήνυσεν εἰπών· Ὧι πλέον ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς, πλέον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ.* (Luke xii. 48.)

Apol. I. c. 19. *p.* 66 *B. Καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον διδάσκαλον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔγνωμεν εἰπόντα· Τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ Θεῷ. Καί· Μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀναιροῦν-*

[1] This apocryphal Gospel dates from about the middle of the second century. Origen refers to it by name. Clem. Alex. seems to refer to its narrative; and so does Justin Martyr. It contains c. 18 the statement of Christ's birth in a cave which fills so large a space in early legend and in Christian art. It has many internal marks of being a supplement to Luke's Gospel, written to counteract the statements of Ebionites and others regarding the ordinary humanity of Jesus Christ. See Tisch., Evang. Apocr., Proleg. p. XIII.

[1] In the following passages are expressions which show that Justin quoted Luke's Gospel. (See this admitted: Davidson, Introd. to N. T. II. 22.) The chief stress must however be laid on the incidents of our Lord's history—at the Birth and the Passion especially—which Justin has noticed, and which are peculiar to Luke. Some of the coincidences of expression are nevertheless striking, and the list of them in the text might perhaps have been increased by adding such as Apol. I. c. 15. p. 62 C, where Justin has Luke's εἰς μετάνοιαν (not genuine in the other Gospels); or Dial. c. 76. p. 301 D, where he has the ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν of Luke xiii. 26, along with the προεφητεύσαμεν of Mat. vii. 22; and Apol. I. c. 66. p. 98 B, where he has τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου (Luke xxii. 19, compare 1 Cor. xi. 25). In all these cases Justin's way of blending his various sources is strikingly seen.

τας ὑμᾶς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ δυναμένους τι ποιῆσαι, εἶπε, φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς γέενναν ἐμβαλεῖν.[2] (Luke xviii. 27; xii. 4; compare Mat. x. 28.)

Apol. I. c. 33. *p.* 75 *A.* Δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτὴν, καὶ κυοφορῆσαι παρθένον οὖσαν πεποίηκε. Καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν παρθένον κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτὴν εἰπών· Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν (compare Mat. i. 21), ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν.[3] (Luke i. 35.)

Apol. I. c. 34. *p.* 75 *E.* Κώμη δέ τις ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ Ἰουδαίων, ἀπέχουσα σταδίους τριάκοντα πέντε Ἱεροσολύμων ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὡς καὶ μαθεῖν δύνασθε ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρώτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου. (Luke ii. 2.[4])

Dial. c. 76. *p.* 301 *D.* Πάλιν ἐν ἑτέροις λόγοις ἔφη· Δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἐξουσίαν καταπατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ σκολοπενδρῶν καὶ ἐπάνω πάσης δυνάμεως τοῦ ἐχθροῦ. (Luke x. 19.)

Dial. c. 76. *p.* 302 *A.* Ἐβόα πρὸ τοῦ σταυρωθῆναι· Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. (Luke ix. 22; compare Mat. xvi. 21; xx. 18; and Mark viii. 31.)

Dial. c. 78. *p.* 303 *D.* Φοβηθεὶς οὖν [sc. Ἰωσὴφ] οὐκ ἐκβέβληκεν αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ, ἀπογραφῆς οὔσης ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, ἀνεληλύθει ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ, ἔνθα ᾤκει, εἰς Βηθλεὲμ, ὅθεν ἦν, ἀπογράψασθαι· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς κατοικούσης τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην φυλῆς Ἰούδα τὸ γένος ἦν. (Luke ii. 1, &c.)

[2] The first part is almost identical with Luke; the second resembles Luke more than Matthew, especially in ἐμβαλεῖν. The same passage is quoted in Clem. Hom XVII. 5, and the parable of the unjust judge is there referred to as an encouragement to the blending of fear with trust in God's justice and long-suffering.

[3] See also Dial. c. 100. p. 327 C, quoted below in this section.

[4] See also (quoted under 'Matthew') Apol. I. c. 46. p. 83 B, and (below) Dial. c. 78. p. 303 D, for notice of Cyrenius and of the Birth.

Dial. c. 78. *p.* 304 *A.* Ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκείνῃ που καταλῦσαι, ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε· καὶ τότε αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐκεῖ, ἐτέτοκει ἡ Μαρία τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ αὐτὸν ἐτεθείκει. (Luke ii. 7.)

Dial. c. 81. *p.* 308 *B.* Ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν, ὅτι Οὔτε γαμήσουσιν οὔτε γαμηθήσονται, ἀλλὰ ἰσάγγελοι ἔσονται, τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὄντες.[5] (Luke xx. 35, 36.)

Dial. c. 84. *p.* 310 *D.* Ἡ μήτηρ γὰρ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ μὴ τίκτουσα διὰ βουλὴν Θεοῦ τέτοκε, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἁγίου πατριάρχου Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἐλισάβετ ἡ τὸν βαπτιστὴν Ἰωάννην τεκοῦσα. (Luke i. 7, 57.)

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 315 *C.* Καὶ γὰρ γεννηθεὶς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔσχε· καὶ αὐξάνων κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων, χρώμενος τοῖς ἁρμόζουσιν, ἑκάστῃ αὐξήσει τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀπένειμε, τρεφόμενος τὰς πάσας τροφὰς (Luke ii. 40) καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη ἢ πλείονα ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα μείνας, μέχρις οὗ προελήλυθεν Ἰωάννης κῆρυξ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.

Dial. c. 96. *p.* 324 *A.* Οὗτος γὰρ ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὔχεσθαι, εἰπών· Γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος. (Luke vi. 36.)

Dial. c. 100. *p.* 327 *C.* Πίστιν δὲ καὶ χαρὰν λαβοῦσα Μαρία ἡ παρθένος εὐαγγελιζομένου αὐτῇ Γαβριὴλ ἀγγέλου ὅτι πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπελεύσεται καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει αὐτὴν, διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅγιόν ἐστι υἱὸς Θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίνατο· Γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου. (See also Apol. I. c. 33. p. 75 A quoted above.)

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *A.* Ἡρώδου δὲ τοῦ Ἀρχέλαον διαδεξαμένου . . . ᾧ καὶ Πιλάτος χαριζόμενος δεδεμένον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔπεμψε. (Luke xxiii. 7.)

Dial. c. 103. *p.* 331 *D.* See before, p. 64. (Luke xxii. 42.)

6. Letter of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons.[1]

Eus. H. E. V. 1. Μετέπειτα δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἡγεμόνα ἀναχθέν-

[5] Justin here follows Luke, whose word ἰσάγγελοι and the closing clause καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν Θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες, are not in Mat. xxii. 30, or Mark xii. 25.

[1] The long letter of the Churches of Gaul on the banks of the Rhone to

των αὐτῶν, κἀκείνου πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὠμότητι χρησαμένου, Οὐέττιος Ἐπάγαθος, εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, πλήρωμα ἀγάπης τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον κεχωρικὼς, (οὗ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἠκρίβωτο ἡ πολιτεία, ὡς καίπερ ὄντα νέον συνεξισοῦσθαι τῇ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρίᾳ· πεπόρευτο γοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτος καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον λειτουργίᾳ ἄοκνος, ζῆλον Θεοῦ πολὺν ἔχων, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι) . . . ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων, παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν χρηματίσας, ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ Πνεῦμα πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου. (Luke i. 6, 67.)

7. Irenaeus.

B. III. 1. *Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο.*[1] (See before, page 67.)

those in Asia and Phrygia is preserved by Eusebius. It contains a touching picture of sufferings which it says the writers are unable to tell or write. Although it does not name the books of the N. T., it has many expressions from the Gospels of Luke and John and from most of the Epistles of Paul inwoven with its simple story. It is the testimony of the church of Irenaeus, and he was the bearer of it (Eus. H. E. V. 4.). Pothinus, who courted martyrdom in the persecution, was more than 90 years old, and was a link between Irenaeus and the Apostolic age. The chief importance of the letter lies in its being the letter of one church to another; for we thus learn how strong was the bond of common knowledge and common hope which bound together the scattered churches of Christendom.

[1] These expressions of Irenaeus are in keeping with the longer passage (III. 14. § 1, 2, 3), with Origen's view (Eus. H. E. VI. 25), with Tertullian's repeated statements (Adv. Marc. IV. 2, 5), and with those of Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 7), all of which are given in the text. Eusebius H. E. III. 4. (see below) does not speak so assuredly, but his only doubt seems to be (φασὶ δέ) whether it was Luke's Gospel that Paul referred to when he said "according to my Gospel." He implies in the previous sentences his belief that while Luke was indebted to all the Apostles he was specially indebted to Paul for the materials of his Gospel. The tradition of the Pauline origin of Luke's Gospel may therefore be regarded as early and wide-spread. There are also internal evidences of the Pauline origin of this Gospel. Take for example the account of the institution of the supper, which corresponds with that in 1 Cor. xi.; or the correspondence in expression between Luke i. ii. and Romans ix. x. xi. Compare further Luke x. 8 with 1 Cor. x. 27; Luke xx. 38 with Rom. xiv. 8. There are also many cases in which the Evangelist and the Apostle use words in the same peculiar sense. See Davidson, Introd. to N. T. II. 12. The purpose and the doctrine of the Gospel are in close affinity with the truth as taught by Paul. See Hilg., Die Evangelien, p. 220, &c., and Baur, Evangelien, p. 480-484. On the whole relation of Paul and Luke, in so far as diction goes, see Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evang., § 19. 10. p. 318, &c. Compare p. 154 note 1, of this book.

B. III. 14. § 1. Quoniam autem is Lucas inseparabilis fuit a Paulo, et cooperarius ejus in evangelio, ipse facit manifestum, non glorians, sed ab ipsa productus veritate.[2] § 2. Sic apostoli simpliciter et nemini invidentes, quae didicerant ipsi a Domino, haec omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemini invidens, ea quae ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testificatur, dicens: *Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi.* (Luke i. 2.) § 3. Si autem quis refutet[3] Lucam, quasi non cognoverit veritatem, manifestus erit projiciens Evangelium, cujus dignatur esse discipulus.[4] Plurima enim et magis necessaria Evangelii per hunc cognovimus, sicut Joannis generationem, et de Zacharia historiam, et adventum angeli ad Mariam, et exclamationem Elizabeth, et angelorum ad pastores descensum, et ea quae ab illis dicta sunt, et Annae et Simeonis de Christo testimonium, et quod duodecim annorum in Hierusalem relictus sit, et baptismum Joannis, et quot annorum Dominus baptizatus sit, et quia in quintodecimo anno Tiberii Caesaris (Luke i. ii. iii). Et in magisterio illud quod ad divites dictum est: "*Vae vobis divites, quoniam percipitis consolationem vestram:*" Et, "*vae vobis qui satiati estis, quoniam esurietis: et qui ridetis nunc, quia plorabitis:*" Et, "*vae vobis cum benedixerint vos homines omnes. Secundum haec enim faciebant et pseudo-prophetis patres vestri:*" (Luke vi. 24 &c.) Et omnia hujusmodi per solum Lucam cognovimus, (et plurimos actus Domini per hunc didicimus, quibus et omnes utuntur[5]): ut multitudinem piscium, quam concluserunt hi qui cum Petro erant, jubente Domino ut mitterent retia (v. 6): et illa quae per octodecim annos passa, curata fuerat mulier die sabbatorum (xiii. 11): et de hydropico, quem curavit Dominus die sabbatorum, et quemadmodum disputavit quod curavit in hac die (xiv. 2): et quemadmodum docuit discipulos primos discubitus non appetere (xiv. 7): et quoniam pauperes et debiles vocare

[2] For the whole passage see below under "Acts of the Apostles."

[3] *Refutare* is used by Irenaeus in the sense of *reject*.

[4] The heretics of whom he here speaks were probably the Marcionites. In the close of the extract he contrasts their rejection of the Gospel with the Valentinian explanation of it.

[5] Both heretics and ordinary Christians were indebted to Luke for special incidents only found in his Gospel and admitted by them all.

oportet, qui non habent retribuere (xiv. 12): et qui pulsavit nocte sumere panes, et propter instantiam importunitatis sumit (xi. 8): et quoniam apud Pharisaeum recumbente eo, peccatrix mulier osculabatur pedes ejus et unguento ungebat, et quaecumque propter eam dixit ad Simonem Dominus de duobus debitoribus (vii. 37): et de parabola divitis illius qui reclusit quae ei nata fuerant cui et dictum est: "In hac nocte expostulabunt animam tuam a te: quae autem praeparasti, cujus erunt?" (xii. 20). Similiter autem et divitis qui vestiebatur purpura, et jocundabatur[6] nitide: et egenum Lazarum (xvi. 20): et eam quam ad discentes suos dixit responsionem, quando dixerunt ei: "Adjice nobis fidem" (xvii. 5): et eam quae ad Zacchaeum publicanum facta est confabulationem (xix. 2): et de Pharisaeo et de publicano, qui simul adorabant in templo (xviii. 10): et de decem leprosis, quos simul emundavit in via (xvii. 12): et quoniam de vicis et plateis claudos et luscos[7] jussit colligi ad nuptias (xiv. 21); et parabolam judicis qui Deum non timebat, quem instantia viduae fecit ut vindicaret eam (xviii. 2): et de arbore fici quae erat in vinea, quae non faciebat fructum (xiii. 6). Et alia multa sunt, quae inveniri possunt a solo Luca dicta esse, quibus et Marcion et Valentinus utuntur. Et super haec omnia, post resurrectionem, in via ad discipulos suos quae loquutus est, et quemadmodum cognoverunt eum in fractione panis. § 4. Necesse est igitur et reliqua quae ab eo dicta sunt, recipere eos, aut et his renuntiare. Non enim conceditur eis ab his qui sensum habent, quaedam quidem recipere ex his quae a Luca dicta sunt, quasi sint veritatis; quaedam vero refutare,[8] quasi non cognovisset veritatem. Et si quidem refutaverint hi qui a Marcione sunt, non habebunt Evangelium: (hoc enim quod est secundum Lucam, quemadmodum praediximus, decurtantes, gloriantur se habere Evangelium) hi vero qui a Valentino sunt cessabunt a plurimo vaniloquio suo: (ex hoc enim multas occasiones subtililoquii sui acceperunt, interpretari audentes male, quae ab hoc bene sunt dicta) si autem et reliqua suscipere cogentur, intendentes per-

[6] Al. vestitur purpuram et jocundabatur.
[7] Al. caecos.
[8] See note 3.

fecto Evangelio,[9] et apostolorum doctrinae, oportet eos poenitentiam agere, ut salvari a periculo possint.

B. III. 10. § 1. Lucas autem sectator et discipulus apostolorum, de Zacharia et Elizabeth, ex quibus secundum repromissionem Dei Joannes natus est, referens ait: "Erant autem justi ambo ante Deum, etc." (Luke i. 6.)

8. Tatian.

Eus. H. E. IV. 49. (See before, page 72.)

Orat. c. Graec. (p. 32). *Γελᾶτε δὲ ὑμεῖς, ὡς καὶ κλαύσοντες.* (Luke vi. 25.)

9. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 33. *Ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται.* (Luke xvi. 18; compare Mat. v. 32; xix. 9.)

10. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. II. (p. 92). *Τὰ γὰρ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατα, δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ Θεῷ.* (Luke xviii. 27; compare Mat. xix. 26; Mark x. 27.)

11. Clement of Alexandria.

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before, page 75.)

Strom. III. (See before, page 75.)

12. Tertullian.

Adv. Marc. IV. 2. (See before, page 76.) There Tertullian calls Luke "*apostolicus, apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio;*" and adds: "Igitur si ipse illuminator Lucae auctoritatem antecessorum et fidei et praedicationi suae optavit, quanto magis eam

[9] Valentine accepted the text in full, but "made it of none effect" by his explanations. (So Tertullian says, *Valentinus integro Instrumento uti videtur.*—De Praescript. Haeret. c. 38.) Marcion, on the other hand, mutilated the Gospel Text.

evangelio Lucae expostulem, quae evangelio magistri ejus fuit necessaria."

Ibid. IV. 5. (See before, page 80.) Nam et Lucae Digestum Paulo adscribere solent &c.

13. Julius Africanus.

Eus. H. E. I. 7. (See before, page 137.)

14. Origen.

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. *Καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον.* (See above, page 8.)

Hom. in Gen. XIII. (above, page 52).

Hom. in Jos., VII. (above, page 52).

Comment. in Joann. (above, page 83, &c.).

In epist. ad Rom. c. xvi. 21. (Migne, vol. IV. p. 1288.) Sed et Lucium quidam ipsum perhibent esse Lucam, qui Evangelium scripsit, pro eo quod soleant nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum etiam secundum Graecam Romanamque proferri.[1]

Dial. de recta in Deum fide. (Migne, vol. I. p. 1721.) *Μάρκος καὶ Λουκᾶς, ἐκ τῶν ὀβ' ὄντες, Παύλῳ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ εὐηγγελίσαντο.*

15. Clementine Homilies.

See Introduction for discussion. For passages in full, see next part of this work. The following references may meanwhile be compared:—

Hom. III. 15 (Luke xix. 43, 44; Mat. xxiv. 2, 34; Mark xiii. 2). *Hom. III.* 63 (Luke xix. 5). *Hom. III.* 71 (Luke x. 7). *Hom. VIII.* 7 (Luke vi. 46; Mat. vii. 21). *Hom. IX.* 22

[1] Origen does not commit himself to the identification of Lucius (Rom. xvi. 21) with the Evangelist Luke. Whether this Lucius was the same as he of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1) is uncertain (see Meyer *in loc.*). But that Lucius of Cyrene is not the same as the Evangelist is clear, because the historian in the Acts does not use the first person (Acts xiii. 3) when speaking of actions in which Lucius took part. Lucas is more probably a contraction for Lucanus, and suggests that it was given to a native of Lucania, or southern Italy. (See after, note 1, under Eusebius.)

(Luke x. 20). *Hom. XI.* 20 (Luke xxiii. 34). *Hom. XVII.* 5 (Luke xii. 4, 5 and xviii. 6-8; Mat. x. 28). *Hom. XIX.* 2 (Luke x. 18).

16. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 25 (before, page 10).

Ibid. III. 24 (before, page 87).

H. E. III. 4. [1] *Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ᾽ Ἀντιοχείας, τὴν ἐπιστήμην δὲ ἰατρὸς, τὰ πλεῖστα συγγεγονὼς τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιληκὼς, ἧς ἀπὸ τούτων προσεκτήσατο ψυχῶν θεραπευτικῆς ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑπομνήματα θεοπνεύστοις κατέλιπε βίβλοις, τῷ τε Εὐαγγελίῳ, ὃ καὶ χαράξαι μαρτυρεῖται καθὰ παρέδοσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπαρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, οἷς καί φησιν ἐπάνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι, καὶ ταῖς τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πράξεσιν, ἃς οὐκέτι δι᾽ ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ παραλαβὼν συνετάξατο. Φασὶ δὲ ὡς ἄρα τοῦ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν Εὐαγγελίου μνημονεύειν ὁ Παῦλος εἴωθεν, ὁπηνίκα ὡς περὶ ἰδίου τινὸς εὐαγγελίου γράφων ἔλεγε "κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου."*

[1] The name Luke is probably, as we have seen, a contraction for Lucanus, or native of Lucania. It is quite possible, nevertheless, that the father of the Evangelist was a Lucanian, while he was himself from Antioch. That he was a physician makes it not improbable that he was a freedman or the son of a freedman, as those born in that position almost filled the medical ranks at the beginning of the Christian era. It is not impossible that he was educated in the Medical School at Tarsus, and, if so, his intimacy with St Paul is easily accounted for. But his intimate acquaintance with Antioch is seen in his giving so fully the names and details in connection with the church there. (Acts vi. 5; xi. 19; xx. 28; xiii. 1; xv. 1-3, 22-25.) He must have met there many who were scattered after the first persecution (Acts xi. 19). He went with Paul to Philippi, and it was his labours in that place which especially won for him Paul's panegyric in 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19. He seems at least to have remained in Philippi when Paul left, as the narrative changes from the first person (Acts xvi. 10) to the third (Acts xvii. 1). The second Ep. to the Corinthians is said to have been "written from Philippi by Titus and Lucas;" and although the report, which Eusebius preserves in the close of the extract, that Paul referred to the Gospel of Luke in 2 Tim. ii. 8, is not likely to be historical, the zeal of Luke in respect of his preaching of the Gospel, and the position which his character and culture had gained for him in many parts of Europe and Asia, marked him out as the Apostle's best colleague in the management of the collection for the poor saints. The constant references to Luke as a physician make it clear that he did not forget the exercise of his professional skill when he was a Christian Teacher. He ministered to Paul in his illnesses, and was with him to the last;—see Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11. (See Plumptre's interesting and ingenious sketch in Introd. to St Luke in Commentary for English Readers.)

17. Epiphanius.

Haeres. tom. I. p. 941 (before, page 21).
Ibid. Haeres. 51 (before, page 95 &c.).[1]

18. Jerome.

Epist. II ad Paulinum (before, page 21).

De vir. Ill. c. 7. Lucas medicus Antiochensis, ut ejus scripta indicant, Graeci sermonis non ignarus fuit, sectator apostoli Pauli, et omnis peregrinationis ejus comes. Scripsit Evangelium, de quo idem Paulus: "Missimus," inquit, "cum illo fratrem, cujus laus est in Evangelio per omnes ecclesias." (2 Cor. viii.) Et ad Colossenses: "Salutat vos Lucas medicus carissimus." Et ad Timotheum: "Lucas est mecum solus." Aliud quoque edidit volumen egregium, quod titulo Apostolicarum *πραξέων* praenotatur, cujus historia usque ad biennium Romae commorantis Pauli pervenit, id est, usque ad quartum Neronis annum. Ex quo intelligimus, in eadem urbe librum esse compositum. . . . Quidam suspicantur, quotiescunque in epistolis suis Paulus dicit: "juxta Evangelium meum," de Lucae significare volumine: et Lucam non solum ab apostolo Paulo didicisse Evangelium, qui cum Domino in carne non fuerat, sed et a caeteris apostolis. Quod ipse quoque in principio sui voluminis declarat, dicens: "Sicut tradiderunt nobis, qui a principio ipsi viderunt, et ministri fuerunt sermonis." Igitur Evangelium sicut audierat, scripsit. Acta vero Apostolorum sicut viderat, composuit. Sepultus est Constantinopoli, ad quam urbem vicesimo Constantii anno, ossa ejus cum reliquiis Andreae apostoli translata sunt.

Comment. in Isai. III. 6. Evangelistam Lucam tradunt veteres Ecclesiae Tractatores medicinae artis fuisse scientissimum, et magis Graecas literas scisse quam Hebraeas. Unde et sermo

[1] Epiphanius, Haer. 51. 11, says Luke preached the Gospel in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, Macedonia, but first in Gallia; and founds upon the reading *Gallia* (for Galatia) in 2 Tim. iv. 10, which is also supported by ℵ and C. If he accompanied Paul on his last journey into Spain, the tradition of his connection with Gaul may be so far well-founded. "Lucanus" the poet was a native of Spain. But all that regards Luke after Paul's death is uncertain; the conjectures of recent writers being too obviously baseless.

ejus tam in Evangelio, quam in Actibus Apostolorum, id est, in utroque volumine comptior est, et saecularem redolet eloquentiam, magisque testimoniis Graecis utitur quam Hebraicis.

Epist. Damaso 145. Lucas igitur, qui inter omnes evangelistas Graeci sermonis eruditissimus fuit, quippe et medicus, et qui Evangelium Graecis scripserit, quia se vidit proprietatem sermonis.

Catal. script. eccl. c. 7. Lucas medicus, natione Syrus Antiochensis, cujus laus in Evangelio, qui et ipse discipulus Pauli Apostoli, in Achaiae Boeotiae partibus volumen condidit.[1]

[1] Luke is much more likely to have written his Gospel in Cesarea during Paul's imprisonment there. The narrative of the Acts ends with the Roman imprisonment, *i.e.*, about A D. 63; and the Gospel is spoken of as an earlier treatise—apparently a considerable time earlier. The time A.D. 58-60 while Paul was in Cesarea is therefore probable. Luke's own diligent inquiries would be facilitated by his residing in Cesarea. His information regarding the Herodian family would be easily gained there. Compare Luke iii. 1; xiii. 32; xxiii. 5-12; Acts xii. 1-25; xxv. 13; xxvi. 32. Plumptre (see before, on Euseb. note 1) suggests that he owed it to Manaen (Acts xiii. 1); but this idea, while possible, seems unnecessary.

IX.

GOSPEL OF JOHN.

1. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. [1] *Κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως. Ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν* [2] *περὶ γυναικὸς, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει.* [3]

Irenaeus V. 36. 2. [4] *Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον· Ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μονὰς εἶναι πολλάς* (see above, page 72).

Anastasius Sinaita. (See before, page 59.)

(Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae, I. 16.*)*

Maria mater Domini, Maria Cleophae, sive Alphei, uxor, quae fuit mater Jacobi episcopi et apostoli, et Symonis, et Thadei, et cujusdam Joseph; Maria Salome, uxor Zebedei, mater Joannis evangelistae, et Jacobi (compare Mat. xxvii. 5, 6; Mark xv. 40 and xvi. 1); Maria Magdalena. Istae quatuor in evangelio reperiuntur. . . . Maria Jacobi minoris, et Joseph, mater, uxor Alphei, soror fuit Mariae matris Domini, quam Cleophae Joannes nominat (John xix. 25) vel a patre, vel a gentilitatis familia, vel alia causa.

[*Note.* This is taken from a MS of the fourteenth century, and is not by the Apostolic Papias, but by a Latin lexicographer of the same name in the eleventh century.]

[1] The first sentence distinctly says that Papias quoted from the first epistle of John, which is admitted to be by the same author as the Gospel. The collocation of 1 Peter with it may perhaps indicate that Papias was grouping Mark's Gospel and Peter's Epistle, on the one hand, with John's Gospel and Epistle, on the other. Something like this may have also suggested the Muratorian testimony that John was an eye-witness, while the statement of the last sentences upon Mark's Gospel in that fragment may have been that Mark was not an eye-witness, but only the amanuensis of Peter.

[2] The second sentence is supposed to refer to the *pericope adulterae* (John vii. 53—viii. 11), which is not an original part of John's Gospel.

[3] Papias's words, αὕτη ἡ ἀληθεία, see p. 54, are like John if they are a designation of Christ, but that is doubtful. The use of ἐντολή to describe Christ's doctrine is also like John. See page 54.

[4] The whole passage may be a quotation from Papias. See Routh, Rel. Sac. pp. 11, 19; and Davidson, Int. N. T. II. 372.

Val. Alex. No. 14. *Note prefixed to John's Gospel.*

Evangelium johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab johanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus johannis carus in exotericis [exegeticis], id est in extremis, quinque libris retulit. Disscripsit vero evangelium dictante johanne recte; verum Martion haereticus cum ab eo fuisset improbatus eo quod contraria sentiebat, abjectus est a johanne. Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.

[*Note.*—The MS is ascribed to the ninth century, but the prefatory note is old, older than Jerome, in Tischendorf's opinion. The passage seems to be made up of detached notices. The account of Marcion is an anachronism. *Disscripsit vero evangelium* is supposed to have been a translation of ὃ ἀπέγραφον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ἀπέγραφον being third person plural, but mistaken by some later writer for the first person singular, so as to make Papias himself the amanuensis. (See Lightfoot, Contemp. Review, October 1875, p. 854.)]

2. Barnabas.

C. 2. 6. Ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. (Compare John xiii. 34, ἡ καινὴ ἐντολή.)

C. 5. 1. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὑπέμεινεν ὁ Κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἁγνισθῶμεν, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ. (John xi. 55.)

C. 5. 7. Ἵνα καὶ τοῖς πατράσι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποδῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινὸν ἑτοιμάζων ἐπιδείξῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤν, ὅτι τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσας κρινεῖ. (John v. 21, &c.)

C. 5. 9.[1] Ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν Θεοῦ. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί, οὐδ' ἄν πως οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐσώθησαν βλέποντες αὐτόν.

C. 5. 13. Ἔδει γὰρ ἵνα ἐπὶ ξύλου πάθῃ, λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφητεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ· Φεῖσαί μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ ῥομφαίας.[2] (See John xix. 34.)

[1] See first part of passage, before, page 102. For ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί see also Barn. c. 5. 11.

[2] This is quoted because it is said that, had the author known what John says of the Roman soldier's spear, he could not have written it. But that by no means follows.

C. 6. 6. *Τί οὖν λέγει πάλιν ὁ προφήτης; Περιέσχεν με συναγωγὴ πονηρευομένων, ἐκύκλωσάν με ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον· καί· Ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.* (Compare John xix. 24. See also Justin, Apol. I. c. 38. p. 77 D.)

C. 6. 7. *Ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος φανεροῦσθαι καὶ πάσχειν, προεφανερώθη τὸ πάθος. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ· κ.τ.λ.* (John i. 31; 1 John i. 2; 1 John iii. 5-8; also 1 Tim. iii. 16.)

C. 6. 9. *Τί δὲ λέγει ἡ γνῶσις; Μάθετε· Ἐλπίσατε, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανεροῦσθαι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν.* (See also C. 5, 6; 6, 14; 12, 10.)

C. 7. 2. *Εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος, καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς.*[3] (John v. 21; xii. 5.)

C. 7. 9. *Ἐπειδὴ ὄψονται αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ποδήρη ἔχοντα τὸν κόκκινον περὶ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ ἐροῦσιν· Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν ποτε ἡμεῖς ἐσταυρώσαμεν ἐξουθενήσαντες καὶ κατακεντήσαντες καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες; Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ἦν ὁ τότε λέγων ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι.* (Compare John xix. 37 and Mat. xxvii. 28, 30.)

C. 8. 5. *Ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον· ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου, καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν ζήσονται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* (See also c. 6. 3; 11. 10 below; 11. 11. Compare John vi. 51, 58; and Ezek. xlvii. 1-12.)

C. 9. 7. *Μάθετε οὖν, τέκνα ἀγάπης, περὶ πάντων πλουσίως, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ πρῶτος περιτομὴν δοὺς ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιέτεμεν, λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων δόγματα.*[4] (John viii. 56.)

C. 11. 10. *Ὃς ἂν φάγῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* (See also 11. 11; John iv. 14; vi. 51.)

C. 12. 5. *Πάλιν Μωϋσῆς ποιεῖ τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ αὐ-*

[3] See also Barn. c. 6. 17, ζωοποιούμενοι ζήσομεν.

[4] Here follows a dissertation on the three letters ΣΙΗ (318), of which, according to "Barnabas," the first indicates the cross (σταυρός) and the other two are the first letters of the name Ἰησοῦς!

τὸν παθεῖν καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσει κ.τ.λ. (See long passage, treating of the serpent as a type of Christ; compare John iii. 14.)

C. 16. 8. Λαβόντες τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐγενόμεθα καινοὶ, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι· διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ Θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν. (John iii. 3; compare Eph. iii. 17.)

C. 19. 1. Ἡ οὖν ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός ἐστιν αὕτη· ἐάν τις θέλων ὁδὸν ὁδεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν ὡρισμένον τόπον, σπεύσῃ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ. (Compare John iii. 20; xiv. 6.)

C. 19. 12. Οὐ προσήξεις ἐπὶ προσευχὴν ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ. (Compare John ix. 31.)

C. 21. 2. Ἐρωτῶ τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας, εἴ τινά μου γνώμης ἀγαθῆς λαμβάνετε συμβουλίαν· ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς οὓς ἐργάσησθε· τὸ καλὸν μὴ ἐγκαταλείπητε. (Compare John xii. 8.)

C. 21. 6. Γίνεσθε δὲ θεοδίδακτοι, ἐκζητοῦντες τί ζητεῖ Κύριος ἀφ' ὑμῶν, καὶ ποιεῖτε ἵνα εὑρεθῆτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. (Compare John vi. 45.)

[*Note.* Besides the passages quoted above, Keim (Jesus of Nazara, vol. i. p. 193, note) enumerates the following resemblances: ἐποίησεν ἐντολήν, c. 6; ὑπέμεινε παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα, c. 6; αὐτὸς ἠθέλησεν οὕτω παθεῖν, c. 5; ἐπιθυμία σαρκὸς, c. 10; Spirit, cc. 1, 5, 16; Gnosis, cc. 1, 10; new birth, c. 16; taught of God, c. 21; temple of God, ναὸς ἁγ. τέλειος, κατοικητήριον, Θεὸς κατοικῶν ἐν, cc. 4, 6; καινὸς νόμος, c. 2; ἐντολή, πᾶσα ἐντολή, cc. 9, 19, 21; love of the brethren, cc. 1, 4; joy, cc. 7, 21.]

3. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 31. 2. Τίνος χάριν ηὐλογήθη ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ; οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας; (John iii. 21; compare 1 John i. 6.)

C. 43. 6. Τί δοκεῖτε ἀγαπητοί; οὐ προῄδει Μωϋσῆς τοῦτο μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι; μάλιστα ᾔδει, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀκαταστασία γένηται ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, οὕτως ἐποίησεν εἰς τὸ δοξασθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ

[1] The passages which follow may be regarded as suggesting John's Gospel, if not actually quoting it: they are echoes if not citations. There may be added to them as fainter echoes c. 31. 2, comp. John iii. 21; c. 42. 1, comp. John xvii. 3, and xx. 21; c. 47. 4, comp. John xix. 11; c. 48. 4, comp. John x. 7. 9; c. 49. 6, comp. John xv. 12.

ἀληθινοῦ καὶ μόνου Κυρίου[2] *[Θεοῦ]· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.* (John xvii. 3; 1 John v. 20.)

C. 49. 1. *Ὁ ἔχων ἀγάπην ἐν Χριστῷ ποιησάτω τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραγγέλματα.* (John xiv. 15, 23; compare 1 John v. 1-3.)

C. 49. 6. *Τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.* (John vi. 51; xv. 13.)

Second Epistle.

C. 3. 1. *Ἔγνωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν πάτερα τῆς ἀληθείας.* (John i. 18; xiv. 9.)

C. 6. 9. *Τίς ἡμῶν παράκλητος ἔσται ἐὰν μὴ εὑρεθῶμεν ἔργα ἔχοντες ὅσια καὶ δίκαια;* (John xv. 26.)

C. 9. 5. *Εἰ Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ὁ σώσας ἡμᾶς, ὢν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα, ἐγένετο σὰρξ καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν.* (John i. 14.)

Hieron. in Jes. 53. 13.[3] Clemens, vir apostolicus, qui post Petrum Romanam rexit ecclesiam, scribit ad Corinthios: "Sceptrum Dei, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, non venit in jactantia superbiae, quum possit omnia, sed in humilitate, in tantum ut verberatus a ministro sacerdotis responderit: Si male locutus sum, argue de peccato, sin autem bene, quid me caedis?" (John xviii. 22, 23.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

Eph. c. 17. *Διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν. Μὴ ἀλείφεσθε δυσ-*

[2] The Syriac translates as though μόνου ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ. The MS of Bryennios reads Κυρίου.

[3] The passage in Clement to which Jerome refers is in C. 16 of his (first) Epistle: Τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζονείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίπερ δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν, καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησεν: φησὶν γάρ· κ.τ.λ. Then follows a quotation of Isaiah liii. 1-12. In these words Jerome seems to quote Clement from memory, and then to run into another quotation of his own from the Gospel.

[1] In addition to the following passages, which may be regarded as quotations, there may be taken as Echoes: Eph. 7. 2, and 11. 1, comp. John xvii. 3; Magnes. 7. 1, comp. John v. 19; Magnes. 7. 2, comp. John xvi. 28; Smyrn. 4. 1, comp. John xvii. 3; Trall. 9. 2, comp. John xvii. 3.

ωδίαν τῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, μὴ αἰχμαλωτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ προκειμένου ζῆν. Διὰ τί δὲ οὐ πάντες φρόνιμοι γινόμεθα, λαβόντες Θεοῦ γνῶσιν, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; Τί μωρῶς ἀπολλύμεθα, ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ Χάρισμα, ὃ πέπομφεν ἀληθῶς ὁ Κύριος; (John xii. 3, 4.)

Eph. c. 18. 2. *Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου.* (John vii. 42.)

Magnes. c. 8. 2. *Εἷς Θεὸς ἐστὶν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος, ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών,*[2] *ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν.* (John viii. 29.)

Trall. c. 8. *Ὑμεῖς οὖν τὴν πραϋπάθειαν ἀναλαβόντες ἀνακτίσασθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίστει, ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ὅ ἐστιν αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* (John vi. 51.)

Rom. c. 7. 1. *Ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου διαρπάσαι με βούλεται* (compare *τοῦ κόσμου* in John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11).

Rom. c. 7. 2.[3] *Ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· "δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα." Οὐχ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς, οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου· ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ὅ ἐστι σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ· καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος.* (John vi. 32, 33, 54-58; iv. 14.)

Philad. 2. 1. *Τέκνα οὖν φωτὸς ἀληθείας, φεύγετε τὸν μερισμὸν καὶ τὰς κακοδιδασκαλίας· ὅπου δὲ ὁ ποιμήν ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ ὡς πρόβατα ἀκολουθεῖτε.* (John x. 4; xii. 26.)

Philad. 7. 1. *Εἰ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα μέ τινες ἠθέλησαν πλανῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν· οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει.* (John iii. 8.)

Philad. 9. 1. *Καλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς, κρείσσων δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ὃς μόνος πεπίστευται τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ· αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία.* (John x. 7.)

[2] Compare Basilides below, p. 173; and Tatian.

[3] In this passage occur πόμα Θεοῦ, while it is πόσις in John vi. 55; and ἀέννaος ζωή, while ζωὴ αἰώνιος is the ordinary phrase in John.

5. Basilides.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 22. Ἐπεὶ δ' ἦν ἄπορον εἰπεῖν προβολήν τινα τοῦ μὴ ὄντος Θεοῦ γεγονέναι τι οὐκ ὄν,—φεύγει γὰρ πάνυ καὶ δέδοικε τὰς κατὰ προβολὴν τῶν γεγονότων οὐσίας ὁ Βασιλείδης—ποίας γὰρ προβολῆς χρεία, ἢ ποίας ὕλης ὑπόθεσις, ἵνα κόσμον Θεὸς ἐργάσηται, καθάπερ ὁ ἀράχνης τὰ μηρύματα, ἢ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος χαλκὸν ἢ ξύλον, ἤ τι τῶν τῆς ὕλης μερῶν ἐργαζόμενος λαμβάνει; Ἀλλὰ εἶπε, φησὶ, καὶ ἐγένετο, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι, τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ Μωσέως· Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. Πόθεν, φησὶ, γέγονε τὸ φῶς; ἐξ οὐδενός· οὐ γὰρ γέγραπται, φησὶ, πόθεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μόνον ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ λέγοντος, ὃ δὲ λέγων, φησὶν, οὐκ ἦν, οὐδὲ τὸ γενόμενον ἦν. Γέγονε, φησὶν, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ λόγος ὁ λεχθείς· γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἔστι τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Λαμβάνει τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος ἐκείνου καὶ φωτίζεται. (John i. 9.)

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 27. Ὅτι δὲ, φησὶν, ἕκαστον ἰδίους ἔχει καιροὺς ἱκανὸς ὁ σωτὴρ λέγων· Οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου καὶ οἱ μάγοι τὸν ἀστέρα τεθεαμένοι· ἦν γὰρ, φησὶ, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ γένεσιν ἀστέρων καὶ ὡρῶν ἀποκαταστάσεως ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ προλελογισμένος σωρῷ. (John ii. 4.)

6. Acts of Pilate.

C. 6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰουδαῖος ἔφη· Ἐγὼ τριάκοντα ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἐν κλίνῃ κατεκείμην ἐν ὀδύνῃ πόνων. . . . Καὶ ἰδών με ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ λόγον εἶπέν μοι· Ἆρόν σου τὸν κράββατον καὶ πε-

[1] On Basilides see Introduction. Because of its special importance the passage is given here to complete the chain of testimony on the Fourth Gospel. For further references in Gnostic writers see below, "Testimony of Heretics." There can be no doubt that the quotations in the text are from John. The question is whether Basilides or a Basilidean of later date made them. On this see Introduction, where the conclusion is that the reference is (as is natural) to Basilides himself. It is to be observed that the use of λεχθὲν γέγραπται, ὁ λόγος ὁ λεχθείς, τὸ λεγόμενον to mark quotation from the Old Testament and from the New is significant. He also says, ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις: pointing to a collection, or at least to an understood number.

ριπάτει. Καὶ ἦρα τὸν κράββατόν μου καὶ περιεπάτησα . . . ἐν σαββάτῳ. (Compare John v. 2.)

[*Note.*—Justin twice quotes a work to which he gives this name. Thus he says, after quoting some incidents of the crucifixion of Jesus, Apol. I. c. 35. p. 76 C.: Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἄκτων. And so also in nearly the same words, Apol. I. c. 48, p. 84 C. Compare also a more general reference, Apol. I. c. 38, p. 77 B. So also Tertullian (Apologet. c. 21), after recounting the incidents of the Death and Burial and Resurrection of Jesus, says: Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Caesari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit. See Tisch., Evangelia Apocrypha, Proleg. p. LXII, &c., for a full discussion of the age of the Christian document known as the "Acts of Pilate." Although interpolated at a later time, and although it is very unlike what an official report of the procurator to the Emperor would have been, it seems to be of very old date, and, as part of the so-called "Gospel of Nicodemus," is well known. If the book we now have is substantially that which Justin referred to, believing it to be a standard document, it is valuable evidence for the previous existence of the Gospel of John, on which it is largely based. See, *e.g.*, chapter iii. Tisch., Ev. Apoc., p. 218. Its title in the MSS is not Ἄκτα, as in Justin, but Ὑπομνήματα. Eusebius (H. E. II. 2) and Epiphanius (Haer. L. 1) testify to the existence of such a book; and the Emperor Maximin caused a heathen and anti-christian book under the same title to be widely circulated, and even to be committed to memory by boys at school.]

7. Polycarp.

See under 1 John.[1]

8. Martyrdom of Polycarp.

14. 2. *Εὐλογῶ σε ὅτι ἠξίωσάς με . . . εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου· ἐν οἷς προσδεχθείην ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον ἐν θυσίᾳ πίονι καὶ προσδεκτῇ, καθὼς προητοίμασας καὶ προεφανέρωσας καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.* (John v. 29; xvii. 3.)

9. Hermas.

Mand. XII. 3. 5. *Ἐὰν σὺ σεαυτῷ προθῇς ὅτι δύνανται φυ-*

[1] The words of Polycarp, c. VII. are from 1 John iv. 3, and the Gospel and Epistle hang together so closely that the quotation has its value under the head of the Gospel.

λαχθῆναι, εὐκόπως αὐτὰς [sc. τὰς ἐντολὰς] φυλάξεις, καὶ οὐκ ἔσονται σκληραί. (John xiv. 12; vi. 60.)

Sim. V. 5. 2. Ὁ δὲ δοῦλος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν· αἱ δὲ ἄμπελοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν αὐτὸς ἐφύτευσεν· οἱ δὲ χάρακες οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοί εἰσι τοῦ Κυρίου οἱ συγκρατοῦντες τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ· αἱ δὲ βοτάναι αἱ ἐκτετιλμέναι ἐκ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, [αἱ] ἀνομίαι εἰσὶ τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ· τὰ δὲ ἐδέσματα ἃ ἔπεμψεν ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, αἱ ἐντολαί εἰσιν ἃς ἔδωκε τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ φίλοι καὶ σύμβουλοι, οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι οἱ πρῶτοι κτισθέντες· ἡ δὲ ἀποδημία τοῦ δεσπότου, ὁ χρόνος ὁ περισσεύων εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ.[1]

Sim. V. 6. 2. Ὅτι, φησὶν, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσε, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τὸν λαὸν ἔκτισε καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κατέστησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοῦ συντηρεῖν αὐτούς· καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐκαθάρισε πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ πολλοὺς κόπους ἠντληκώς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ [ἀμπελὼν] δύναται σκαφῆναι ἄτερ κόπου ἢ μόχθου.[2]

Sim. V. 6. 3. Αὐτὸς οὖν καθαρίσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς τρίβους τῆς ζωῆς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸν νόμον ὃν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. (John x. 18; xii. 49, &c.)

Sim. IX. 12. 1. Πρῶτον, φημὶ, πάντων, Κύριε, τοῦτό μοι δήλωσον· ἡ πέτρα καὶ ἡ πύλη τίς ἐστιν; Ἡ πέτρα, φησὶν, αὕτη καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστί. Πῶς, φημὶ, Κύριε, ἡ πέτρα παλαιά ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ πύλη καινή; Ἄκουε, φησὶ, καὶ σύνιε, ἀσύνετε· Ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε σύμβουλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παλαιός ἐστιν. Ἡ δὲ πύλη διατὶ καινὴ, φημὶ, Κύριε; Ὅτι, φησὶν, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας φανερὸς ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο καινὴ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σώζεσθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσι τοῦ Θεοῦ. . . .

[1] This passage was mentioned in a note under "The Apostolical Fathers and the Synoptists." It is given here as an example of Hermas's relation to St John. Many passages in John are suggested by it. The ἐντολαί suggest many passages in chapters xii.-xvii.; 1 John ii. 3, &c. But the whole of the suggestions are provoking rather than satisfactory, when words and phrases are considered; they come much closer when their theology is studied. The dignity, mission, and sufferings of God's Son are prominent in Hermas's teaching, and remind us of the Fourth Gospel at every turn. Compare also the following extract, and compare John xv. with Sim. VIII.

[2] See last note. Compare also Mark xii. 1; Heb. v. 8, 9; Isaiah v. 7.

Ἐὰν γὰρ εἰς πόλιν θελήσῃς εἰσελθεῖν τινὰ, κἀκείνη ἡ πόλις περιτετειχισμένη κύκλῳ καὶ μίαν ἔχει πύλην, μήτι δυνήσῃ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην εἰσελθεῖν εἰ μὴ διὰ τῆς πύλης ἧς ἔχει; Πῶς γὰρ, φημὶ, Κύριε, δύναται γενέσθαι ἄλλως; Εἰ οὖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν οὐ δυνήσῃ εἰσελθεῖν εἰ μὴ διὰ τῆς πύλης αὐτῆς, οὕτω, φησὶ, καὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄλλως εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.[3]

10. Justin Martyr.

Apol. I. c. 5. p. 56 A. Ἠλέγχθη ταῦτα . . . ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος.

Apol. I. c. 21. p. 66 E.[1] *Τὸν λόγον, ὅ ἐστι πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄνευ ἐπιμιξίας φάσκειν ἡμᾶς γεγεννῆσθαι, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν διδάσκαλον ἡμῶν.* (John i. 1.)

Apol. I. c. 22. p. 67 E. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν γεγεννῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λέγομεν λόγον Θεοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν. (Compare I. 21.)

Apol. I. c. 23. p. 68 C. Καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ Θεῷ γεγέννηται, λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων.

Apol. I. c. 32. p. 74 B. Ἡ δὲ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην Θεὸν καὶ υἱὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστίν· ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐροῦμεν. (John i. 1.)

Apol. I. c. 35. p. 76 A. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης Ἡσαΐας θεοφορούμενος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ ἔφη. . . . Αἰτοῦσί με νῦν κρίσιν. . . . Καὶ γὰρ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης, διασύροντες αὐτὸν ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ εἶπον· Κρῖνον ἡμῖν.[2] (Isa. lviii. 2; John xix. 13.)

[3] Compare John x., &c. also Hegesipp. ap. Eus. H. E. II. 23. 8; Ignat. ad Philad. c. 9. 1; Clem. Hom. III. 52.

[1] There are several passages in Justin which may be referred to the Prologue of John's Gospel. They seem to show that Justin's theology was grounded upon John. The use of μονογενής in connection with the mention of the "Memoirs" is interesting, and looks as if the Fourth Gospel were included. See Dial. c. 105, p. 332 C. below. It is certain that Justin knew the Apocalypse (Dial. c. 81), but he does not quote Apoc. xix. 13, in which it is said, "His name shall be called the λόγος of God."

[2] Justin is arguing for the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah; and it is suggested (see Drummond in Theol. Rev., July 1877) that he quotes the words of the

Apol. I. c. 53. p. 88 A. Τίνι γὰρ ἂν λόγῳ ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι ἐπειθόμεθα, ὅτι πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ ἐστι.

Apol. I. c. 61. p. 94 A. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον, εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι.[3]

Apol. I. c. 63. p. 95 D. Ὁ λόγος δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ.

Apol. I. c. 66. p. 98 A. Διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν.[4]

Apol. II. c. 6. p. 44 D. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε. (Compare Dial. c. 62. p. 285 D.)

Dial. c. 48. p. 267 B. Τὸ γὰρ λέγειν σε προϋπάρχειν Θεὸν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν, εἶτα καὶ γεννηθῆναι ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον ὑπομεῖναι κ.τ.λ.

Dial. c. 62. p. 285 D. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῷ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τούτῳ ὁ πατὴρ προσομιλεῖ.

Dial. c. 63. p. 286 C. Ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ· οὐ δοκεῖ σοι λελέχθαι ὡς οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἔχοντος τὸ γένος τοῦ διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς θάνατον παραδεδόσθαι εἰρημένου ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ; (John i. 13.)

Dial. c. 69. p. 295 D. Τοὺς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα πηροὺς καὶ κωφοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς ἰάσατο, τὸν μὲν ἄλλεσθαι, τὸν δὲ καὶ ἀκούειν, τὸν δὲ καὶ ὁρᾶν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ποιήσας. (John ix. 1 &c.) (See also Apol. I. c. 22. p. 68 B. *ἐκ γενετῆς πονηρούς.*)

Gospel, changing ἐκάθισεν into ἐκάθισαν, and making it transitive. In c. 32 Justin adds to the Synoptic account of Christ riding on an ass the statement that it was bound to a vine, so as to connect it with Gen. xlix. 11; and it is supposed that he similarly adds κρῖνον ἡμῖν to the Johannine narrative, in order to connect it with Isaiah's αἰτοῦσί με νῦν κρίσιν. See Hilg., Die Evang. Justins, p. 224.

[3] The preceding words refer to Baptism in the name of the Trinity (as in Matthew's Gospel). The Gospel of Matthew is thus joined with that of John. The reading βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν in John's Gospel is adopted by Tischendorf after ℵ. The same reading is found in Clem. Hom. XI. 26 (quoted in our text, below); Apost. Constt. &c. see Tisch., Gr. Test. in loc. The Ὅτι δὲ κ.τ.λ. clearly refers to John.

[4] See Dial. c. 70. p. 297 A. σωματοποιεῖσθαι.

Dial. c. 88. *p.* 316 *B.* Οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπελάμβανον αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν· πρὸς οὓς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος. (John i. 40.)

Dial. c. 105. *p.* 332 *C.* Μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος, καὶ ὕστερον ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γενόμενος, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων ἐμάθομεν, προεδήλωσα.[5] (John i. 18.)

Dial. c. 114. *p.* 342 *B.* Ὧν αἱ καρδίαι οὕτως περιτετμημέναι εἰσὶν ἀπὸ τῆς πονηρίας, ὡς καὶ χαίρειν ἀποθνήσκοντας διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ τῆς καλῆς πέτρας, καὶ ζῶν ὕδωρ ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ ἀγαπησάντων τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων βρυούσης, καὶ ποτιζούσης τοὺς βουλομένους τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ὕδωρ πιεῖν. (John iv. 10.)

Dial. c. 123. *p.* 353 *B.* Θεοῦ τέκνα ἀληθινὰ καλούμεθα καὶ ἐσμὲν, οἱ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ φυλάσσοντες. (John i. 12; compare 1 John iii. 1-3.)

De Resurrect. c. 1. *p.* 588 *C.* Οὗ γενόμενος υἱὸς ὁ λόγος ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, σάρκα φορέσας, ἑαυτόν τε καὶ τὸν πατέρα μηνύων, διδοὺς ἡμῖν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν καὶ τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα ζωὴν αἰώνιον. (John xi. 25.)

De Resurrect. c. 9. *p.* 594 *D.* Καὶ ψηλαφᾶν αὐτὸν ἐπέτρεπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς τύπους τῶν ἥλων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπεδείκνυε. (John xx. 27.)

De Resurrect. c. 9. *p.* 594 *E.* Βουλόμενος ἐπιδεῖξαι καὶ τοῦτο, (καθὼς εἴρηκεν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν κατοίκησιν ἡμῶν ὑπάρχειν) ὅτι οὐκ ἀδύνατον καὶ σαρκὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνελθεῖν. (John xiv. 2.)

Exposit. fid. 15. *p.* 387 *A.* Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος τοὺς οὐρανοὺς οὐ κατέλιπε.

[*Note.* In an able article in the 'Theological Review' (April 1877), Professor Drummond shows that Justin cannot have been ignorant of the Fourth Gospel, because of his use of the word λόγος. He uses it in its special theological sense 27 times out of 67 in Apol. I.; 16 out of 28 in Apol. II.; 7 out of 235 in the Dialogue. Christ or the λόγος is called Θεός once in the Apology, and "a great number of times (I have counted upwards of 34) in the Dialogue."

[5] Justin's usual word for Christ is πρωτότοκος. Thus Apol. I. c. 46. p. 83 says τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν. There are attempts (see Hilg., Die Evang. Justins, p. 301) to show that the use of μονογενής here is from Psalm xxii. 21. It is true that Justin was dealing with that Psalm in the passage immediately before, but it must be remembered that the reference in our quotation is not to the Psalm, but to the Memoirs.

Those who try to make out that Justin describes the Logos as springing from God, in the first instance, at the creation of the world, while John makes the Logos earlier, do not attach due weight to the following: Justin says, the Son is πρωτότοκος to the unbegotten God, Apol. I. 53-63; and again Apol. II. 6 says, the Logos was with God begotten before all His works; also calls Him γέννημα before the creation πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων; and calls Christ also ὁ Θεός, Dial. c. 56, 75. Though Justin's doctrine savoured more of the Alexandrian theosophy than John's, it was substantially the same. John, Colossians, and Justin are at one. We may add that Justin speaks of the Holy Spirit in connection with His functions of conferring prophetic and other spiritual gifts. His aim was to establish Christ's Divinity; and he does not set himself to speak of the Holy Spirit's Divine Personality. But he does not speak of Him as an offspring or emanation. See Donaldson's Christian Literature and Doctrine, II. 264.

The following additional passages may be regarded as "echoes" of the Fourth Gospel. The list might be increased, but these seem the most important:—

Apol. I. c. 6. p. 56 C, comp. John iv. 24; Apol. I. c. 13. p. 60 D, comp. John xviii. 37; Apol. I. c. 52. p. 87 E, comp. John xix. 37; Apol. I. c. 63. p. 95 D, comp. John xiv. 24, and xvi. 3; Apol. I. c. 66, p. 98 A, comp. John vi. 5, &c. Dial. c. 17. p. 235 B, comp. John i. 9; Dial. c. 56. p. 276 D, comp. John i. 19; xii. 49; Dial. c. 63. p. 286 D, comp. John i. 13; Dial. c. 64. p. 288 D, comp. John i. 1, 14; Dial. c. 69. p. 295 D, comp. John iv. 10, 14; Ibid. p. 296 A, comp. John vii. 12; Dial. c. 91. p. 319 A, comp. John iii. 14-16; Dial. c. 100. p. 326 C, comp. John x. 18; Dial. c. 121. p. 350 B, comp. John xiv. 7; Dial. c. 140. p. 369 D, comp. John iv. 34; xiv. 24, &c., and see also Dial. c. 91. p. 319 A.]

11. Letter to Diognetus.

C. VII. p. 498 *B.* *Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀληθῶς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ παντοκτίστης καὶ ἀόρατος Θεὸς, αὐτὸς ἀπ' οὐρανῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἀπερινόητον ἀνθρώποις ἐνίδρυσε καὶ ἐγκατεστήριξε ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.*

C. X. p. 500 *D.* *Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠγάπησε, δι' οὓς ἐποίησε τὸν κόσμον, οἷς ὑπέταξε πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, . . . πρὸς οὓς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, οἷς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν.* (John iii. 16.)

C. XI. p. 501 *D.* *Οὗτος* (sc. *λόγος*) *ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ καινὸς φανεὶς, καὶ παλαιὸς εὑρεθεὶς, καὶ πάντοτε νέος ἐν ἁγίων καρδίαις γεννώμενος. Οὗτος ὁ ἀεὶ, σήμερον υἱὸς λογισθείς· δι' οὗ πλουτίζεται ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ χάρις ἁπλουμένη ἐν ἁγίοις πληθύ-*

νεται, παρέχουσα νοῦν, φανεροῦσα μυστήρια, διαγγέλλουσα καιροὺς, χαίρουσα ἐπὶ πιστοῖς, ἐπιζητοῦσι δωρουμένη, οἷς ὅρια πίστεως οὐ θραύεται οὐδὲ ὅρια πατέρων παρορίζεται. (John i. 1.)

12. Acts of Paul and Thecla.[1]

C. 5. *Μακάριοι οἱ ἀποταξάμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ εὐθεῖς κληθήσονται.*[2] (John xii. 31.)

C. 25. *Ὁ καιρὸς αἰσχρὸς, καὶ σὺ εὔμορφος· μὴ ἄλλος σε πειρασμὸς λήψεται χείρων τοῦ πρώτου.* (John v. 14.)

C. 29. *Δεῦρο πρόσευξαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ τέκνου μου, ἵνα ζήσεται εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.* (John vi. 51, 58.)

13. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 1. *p.* 303. Burt. *Ζῆλον Θεοῦ πολὺν ἔχων, καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι . . . ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου.* (John xiv. 26.)

Ibid. p. 305. Burt. *Ἐπληροῦτο δὲ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον, ὅτι ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς, ἐν ᾧ πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς, δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ.* (John xvi. 2.)

14. Tatian.[1]

Orat. c. Graec. p. 158 *D. Τοιούτους ἡμᾶς ὄντας μὴ ἀποστυγήσατε, ἀλλὰ παραιτησάμενοι τοὺς δαίμονας Θεῷ τῷ μόνῳ κατακολουθήσατε. Πάντα ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονε οὐδὲ ἕν.* (John i. 3.)

Ibid. p. 152. *Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει . . . ὁ λόγος μέν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ φῶς.* (John i. 5.)

Ibid. p. 145. *Φανερώτερος δὲ ἐκθήσομαι τὰ ἡμέτερα. Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν. Ὁ γὰρ*

[1] Acts of Paul and Thecla. See Introduction, "Apocryphal Literature." This Book is probably that to which Tertullian refers (De Baptismo, c. 17), and dates from some time after the middle of the second century.

[2] The words occur in a speech ascribed to Paul which contains quotations from the Sermon on the Mount and from the Pauline Epistles in the form of Beatitudes.

[1] See before, page 72, note 1.

δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων τοῦ παντὸς ἡ ὑπόστασις, κατὰ μὲν τὴν μηδέπω γεγενημένην ποίησιν μόνος ἦν, καθὸ δὲ πᾶσα δύναμις, ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις ἦν· σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα· σὺν αὐτῷ γὰρ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως, αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπέστησε. Θελήματι δὲ τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτοῦ προπηδᾷ λόγος· ὁ δὲ λόγος οὐ κατὰ κενοῦ χωρήσας, ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πνεύματος γίνεται . . . οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος προελθὼν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἄλογον πεποίηκε τὸν γεγεννηκότα . . . καὶ καθάπερ ὁ λόγος ἐν ἀρχῇ γενηθεὶς, ἀντεγέννησε τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποίησιν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας, οὕτω κἀγὼ τὴν τοῦ λόγου μίμησιν ἀναγεννηθεὶς, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀληθοῦς καταλῆψιν πεποιημένος, μεταριθμίζω τῆς συγγενοῦς ὑλῆς τὴν σύγχυσιν. (John i. 1.)

Ibid. p. 144. *Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν ὀνωνόμαστον Θεὸν δωροδοκητέον.* (John iv. 24.)

15. Athenagoras.

Legatio. p. 10. *Ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς Θεοῦ, λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ· πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Ὄντος δὲ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ, ἑνότητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος, νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (John i. 1-3; xvii. 21-23.)

Ibid. p. 10. *Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, νοῦς ἀΐδιος ὤν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον, ἀΐδιος λογικὸς ὤν.* (John i.)

Ibid. p. 12. *Ἄνθρωποι δὲ, τὸν μὲν ἐνταῦθα ὀλίγου καὶ μικροῦ τινος ἄξιον βίον λελογισμένοι ὑπὸ μόνου δὲ παραπεμπόμενοι τούτου, ὃν ἴσως Θεὸν καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον εἰδέναι τις ἡ τοῦ παιδὸς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἑνότης, τίς ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν κοινωνία, τί τὸ πνεῦμα, τίς ἡ τῶν τοσούτων ἕνωσις, καὶ διαίρεσις ἑνουμένων, τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦ παιδὸς, τοῦ πατρός· πολὺ δὲ καὶ κρείττονα ἢ εἰπεῖν λόγῳ, τὸν ἐκδεχόμενον βίον εἰδότες, ἐὰν καθαροὶ ὄντες ἀπὸ παντὸς παραπεμφθῶμεν ἀδικήματος μεχρὶ τοσούτου δὲ φιλανθρωπότατοι, ὥστε μὴ μόνον στέργειν τοὺς φίλους (ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπᾶτε, φησὶν, τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας, καὶ δανείζετε τοῖς δανείζουσιν ὑμῖν, τίνα μίσθον ἔξετε; τοιοῦτοι δὲ ἡμεῖς ὄντες, καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον βιοῦντες βίον, ἕνα κριθῆναι*

διαφύγωμεν, ἀπιστούμεθα θεοσεβεῖν. (John xvii. 3. Compare Luke vi. 34, 35.)

16. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. II. c. 22. *p.* 100. Ὅθεν διδάσκουσι ἡμᾶς αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει·[1] ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν· δεικνὺς ὅτι ἐν πρώτοις μόνος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος. Ἔπειτα λέγει· καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. (John i. 1 &c.)

17. Muratorian Fragment.[1]

See before, p. 3-8.

18. Irenaeus.

C. haeres. III. 11. 7. See before, p. 67.

Ibid. III. 11. 8. 9. See before, pp. 68, 69.

B. II. 22. 5. Πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννῃ τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδωκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. Παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων.

B. III. 1. 1. Ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.

B. III. 3. 4. Καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκηκοότες αὐτοῦ, ὅτι Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς, ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ πορευθεὶς λούσασθαι, καὶ ἰδὼν ἔσω Κήρινθον, ἐξήλατο τοῦ βαλανείου μὴ λουσάμενος, ἀλλ' ἐπειπών· φύγωμεν, μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλανεῖον συμπέσῃ, ἔνδον ὄντος Κηρίνθου, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροῦ.

Ibid. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ Παύλου μὲν τεθεμελιωμένη, Ἰωάννου δὲ παραμείναντος αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων, μάρτυς ἀληθὴς ἐστι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως.

[1] Theophilus. This is the first quotation from John by name. See before, page 73, note 1.

[1] The Muratorian Fragment may represent the Roman church in accepting the Fourth Gospel.

B. V. 36. 1, 2. *Ὡς οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγουσι, τότε καὶ οἱ μὲν καταξιωθέντες τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς, ἐκεῖσε χωρήσουσιν . . . οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν κατοικήσουσιν· Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον· Ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μονὰς εἶναι πολλάς.* (John xiv. 2.)

B. III. 11. 1. Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inseminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui sunt vulsio[1] ejus quae falso cognominatur scientiae, ut confunderet eos, et suaderet quoniam unus Deus qui omnia fecit per Verbum suum; et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem Patrem Domini: et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de superioribus Christum, quem et impassibilem perseverasse, descendentem in Jesum filium fabricatoris, et iterum revolasse in suum Pleroma: et initium quidem esse Monogenem; Logon autem verum filium Unigeniti: et eam conditionem, quae est secundum nos, non a primo Deo factam, sed a Virtute aliqua valde deorsum subjecta, et abscissa ab eorum communicatione, quae sunt invisibilia et innominabilia. Omnia igitur talia circumscribere volens discipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesia, quia est unus Deus omnipotens, qui per Verbum suum omnia fecit, et visibilia et invisibilia; significans quoque, quoniam per Verbum, per quod Deus perfecit conditionem, in hoc et salutem his qui in conditione sunt praestitit hominibus; sic inchoavit in ea quae est secundum Evangelium doctrina: "In principio erat Verbum."

19. Polycrates.

Eus. H. E. V. 31.[1] *Ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκὼς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος· οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται.* (John xiii. 25.)

[1] Irenaeus. Vulsio, graece ἀπόσπασμα, surculus.

[1] Polycrates. See this passage below in the Appendix to John's Gospel—Helps in the study of the Paschal Controversy. Polycrates was a contemporary of Irenaeus. The passage occurs in his letter to Victor of Rome.

20. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 14.

Ibid. III. 23. "*Ἄκουσον μῦθον οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον, καὶ μνήμῃ παραπεφυλαγμένον. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον.*"

21. Tertullian.[1]

De praescript. haereticor. c. 36. (See before, p. 48.)

Adv. Marcion. IV. 2. (See before, p. 75.)

Ibid. IV. 5. (See before, p. 79.)

Adv. Prax. c. 23. Haec quomodo dicta sunt, evangelizator et utique tam clarus discipulus Joannes, magis quam Praxeas novit.

22. Clementine Homilies.[1]

Hom. III. 25. *Φονεὺς γὰρ ἦν καὶ ψεύστης καὶ μετὰ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡσυχάζειν μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ἄρχειν θέλων.* (John viii. 44.)

Hom. III. 52. *Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθὴς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν· "Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δι' ἐμοῦ εἰσερχόμενος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν ζωήν·" ὡς οὐκ οὔσης ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας. . . . Καὶ πάλιν· Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.* (John x. 9, 27.)

Hom. XI. 26. *Οὕτως γὰρ ἡμῖν ὥμοσεν ὁ προφήτης εἰπών· ἀμὴν ὑμῖν λέγω, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε ὕδατι ζῶντι, εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς, υἱοῦ, ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.* (John iii. 5.)

[1] See before, page 75, for Clement's statement that John, writing after the other Evangelists, was inspired to make a Gospel of a spiritual character. Clement represents the church in Alexandria in accepting the Gospel of John.

[1] Tertullian always used John's Gospel as an acknowledged authority. He represents the African church in accepting the Gospel of John.

[1] See Introduction, "The Clementines." The third extract in the text (from Hom. XIX. 22) is in the portion of the work first published in 1853 by Dressel. The special importance of this quotation in the controversy on the Fourth Gospel suggests its insertion here. For further testimonies see below, "Testimony of Heretics." The text is from Lagarde (1865).

Hom. XIX. 22. Ὄθεν καὶ [διδάσκ]αλος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροῦ καὶ ἀναβλέψαντος παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐξετά[ζων ἐρωτήσασιν, εἰ ἥμαρτ]εν οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, [ἵνα] τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, ἀπεκρίνατο· οὔτε οὗτός τι ἥμαρτεν, οὔτε ὁ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ φανερωθῇ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἰωμένη τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. (John ix. 2, 3.)

For the testimonies of Valentinus and Ptolemaeus, and other Gnostics, see below, "Testimony of Heretics."

23. Origen.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, pp. 8, 9.)
Hom. on Gen. XIII. (See before, p. 51.)
Hom. on Joshua VII. (See before, p. 52.)
Comment. in Joann. (See before, p. 83.)
Homil. in Luc. (See before, p. 81.)
Selecta in Genes. (Opp. II. p. 24.) Ἰωάννης τὴν Ἀσίαν· πρὸς οὓς καὶ διατρίψας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τελευτᾷ·[2]
Comment. in Matt. (Opp. III. p. 719.) Ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον, εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον. Διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἑαυτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα.

24. Dionysius of Alexandria.

Epist. ad Basilid. (See before, p. 86.)
Eus. H. E. VII. 25.[1] (See below, Apocalypse.)

25. Eusebius.[1]

H. E. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)
Ibid. III. 24. (See before, p. 87.)

[1] Origen has no doubt of John's Gospel; he wrote a commentary upon it.
[2] See on John's age and death, Irenaeus III. 3.
[1] Dionysius (in the middle of the third century) opposed the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse (on grounds of style), but accepted the Gospel. See page 86 and note.
[1] Eusebius, who collected traditions from all quarters, has none to record

Ibid. III. 23. *Ἐπὶ τούτοις κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἔτι τῷ βίῳ περιλειπόμενος αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀπόστολος ὅμου καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ἰωάννης τὰς αὐτόθι διεῖπεν ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς. Ὅτι δὲ εἰς τούτους τῷ βίῳ περιῆν, ἀπόχρη διὰ δύο πιστώσασθαι τὸν λόγον μαρτύρων. Πιστοὶ δ' ἂν εἶεν οὗτοι, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πρεσβεύσαντες ὀρθοδοξίας, εἰ δὴ τοιοῦτοι Εἰρηναῖος καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς.*

Chronic. ad ann. XIV. Domitiani. Secundus post Neronem Domitianus christianos persequitur, et sub eo apostolus Joannes ad Patmum insulam relegatus Apocalypsin vidit.

26. Epiphanius.

Haeres. LI. (See before, p. 95.)

Haeres. LXIX. c. 23. l. 2. tom. 2. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐλθὼν ὁ μακάριος, καὶ εὑρὼν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠσχολημένους περὶ τὴν κάτω Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν, καὶ τῶν μὲν Ἐβιωναίων πλανηθέντων διὰ τὴν ἔνσαρκον Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίαν ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ καταγομένην, καὶ Λουκᾶ ἀναγομένην ἄχρι τοῦ Ἀδὰμ, εὑρὼν δὲ τοὺς Κηρινθιανοὺς καὶ Μηρινθιανοὺς ἐκ παρατριβῆς αὐτὸν λέγοντας εἶναι ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τοὺς Ναζαραίους, καὶ ἄλλας πολλὰς αἱρέσεις, ὡς κατόπιν ἐλθὼν (τέταρτος γὰρ οὗτος εὐαγγελίζεται), ἄρχεται ἀνακαλεῖσθαι, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τοὺς πλανηθέντας, καὶ ἠσχολημένους περὶ τὴν κάτω Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν, καὶ λέγειν αὐτοῖς, ὡς κατόπιν βαίνων, καὶ ὁρῶν τινὰς εἰς τραχείας ὁδοὺς κεκλικότας, καὶ ἀφέντας τὴν εὐθεῖαν καὶ ἀληθινὴν, ὡς εἰπεῖν· Ποῖ φέρεσθε; ποῖ βαδίζετε; Οἱ τὴν τραχεῖαν ὁδὸν καὶ σκανδαλώδη, καὶ εἰς χάσμα φέρουσαν βαδίζοντες, ἀνακάμψατε. Οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτως· οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ Μαρίας μόνον ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὁ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἄνωθεν γεγεννημένος· οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ ταύτης ὁρμαστοῦ·[1] *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων Σαλαθιὴλ, καὶ Ζοροβάβελ, καὶ Λαβὶδ, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ Νῶε, καὶ Ἀδάμ· ἀλλὰ Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λό-*

which bore against the authenticity of John's Gospel. Up to his time the Alogi had been its sole opponents.

[1] Another reading is ἁρμοστοῦ, but ὁρμαστοῦ is according to Epiphanius' usage. He speaks of Joseph as betrothed to Mary in his old age; thus following the Apocryphal Gospels.

γος. Τὸ δὲ ἦν, καὶ ἦν, καὶ ἦν, οὐχ ὑποδέχεται τοῦ μὴ εἶναί ποτε. Καὶ ὁρᾷς πῶς εὐθὺς τὰ ἐγγυτάτω πρῶτον σημαίνει. Ὡς Ματθαῖος μὲν τὴν ὁδὸν ἔδειξε διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἠκρίβωσεν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἄνωθεν ἔφερε καί τοι γε τὴν γενεαλογίαν· πῶς τε ὁ Μάρκος περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πεπραγματευμένων, καὶ φωνῆς βοώσης ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ διὰ προφητῶν προπεφητευμένου, καὶ νόμου· πῶς τε ὁ Λουκᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω ἀνῆγεν, ἐσίστερον ἐλθών. Τέταρτος ὁ Ἰωάννης τὴν κορωνίδα καὶ τὸ ἀκραιφνὲς τῆς ἄνω τάξεως, καὶ ἀεὶ οὔσης θεότητος, τὸ ὕστερον ἐδήλωσεν.

Haeres. LI. 28. Ἠλέχθησαν καὶ οἱ ἀποβαλλόμενοι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον, οὓς δικαίως Ἀλόγους καλέσομαι, ἐπειδὴ τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποβάλλονται, τὸν διὰ Ἰωάννην κηρυχθέντα πατρικὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ κατεληλυθότα, καὶ σωτηρίαν ἡμῖν ἐργασάμενον, τῆς πάσης αὐτοῦ ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας κ.τ.λ.

Haeres. LI. 33. Αὐτοῦ δὲ προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἀνωτάτω, ὅτε εἰς τὴν Πάτμον νῆσον ὑπῆρξεν.

27. Jerome.

Epist. II. ad Paulinum. (See before, p. 21.)

Comment. in Matth. Argum. (See before, p. 100.)

Catal. script. eccl. c. 9. Joannes Apostolus, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, filius Zebedaei, frater Jacobi apostoli, quem Herodes post passionem Domini decollaverat, novissimus omnium scripsit Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiae episcopis, adversus Cerinthum, aliosque haereticos, et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse. Unde et compulsus est divinam ejus nativitatem edicere. Sed et aliam causam hujus scripturae ferunt: quod cum legisset Matthaei, Marci et Lucae volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiae, et vera eos dixisse firmaverit; sed unius tantum anni, in quo et passus est, post carcerem Joannis, historiam texuisse. Praetermisso itaque anno, cujus acta a tribus exposita fuerant, superioris temporis antequam Joannes clauderetur in carcerem, gesta narravit, sicut manifestum esse poterit his qui diligenter quatuor Evangeliorum volumina legerint. Quae res etiam *διαφωνίαν*, quae videtur Joannis esse cum caeteris, tollit.

Scripsit autem et unam epistolam, cujus exordium est: "quod fuit ab initio, quod audivimus et vidimus oculis nostris, quod perspeximus, et manus nostrae contrectaverunt, de verbo vitae;" quae ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur. Reliquae autem duae, quarum principium est: "Senior electae dominae et natis ejus;" et sequentis: "Senior Cajo carissimo, quem ego diligo in veritate," Joannis Presbyteri asseruntur, cujus et hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur; etsi nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Joannis evangelistae esse, super qua re quum per ordinem ad Papiam auditorem ejus ventum fuerit, disseremus. Quarto decimo igitur anno, secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano, in Patmos insulam relegatus, scripsit Apocalypsim, quam interpretatur Justinus Martyr et Irenaeus. Interfecto autem Domitiano, et actis ejus ob nimiam crudelitatem a senatu rescissis, sub Nerva principe redit Ephesum: ibique usque ad Trajanum principem perseverans, totas Asiae fundavit rexitque ecclesias: et confectus senio, sexagesimo octavo post passionem Domini anno mortuus, juxta eandem urbem sepultus est.

Praefatio in codd. antiq. Hoc Evangelium scripsit in Asia, posteaquam in Patmos insula Apocalypsin scripserat . . . post omnes Evangelium scripsit.

Adv. Jovinianum I. 26. Joannes unus ex discipulis, qui minimus traditur fuisse inter apostolos, et quem fides Christi virginem repererat, virgo permansit. . . . Ut autem sciamus, Joannem tunc fuisse puerum, manifestissime docent ecclesiasticae historiae, quod usque ad Trajani vixerit imperium, *i.e.* post passionem Domini sexagesimo octavo anno dormierit.

Comment. in Dan. c. 9. Tradentibus ecclesiasticis historiis Joannem evangelistam usque ad tempora vixisse Trajani.

APPENDIX

TO TESTIMONIES TO JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

Reference is usually made to the following passages in modern discussions regarding John's Gospel. The ancient controversy (see the opening sentence below from Eusebius) was as to the propriety of the Churches in Asia Minor closing their Fast on the 14th day of the month at Easter. John's authority was claimed for this practice. The modern controversy is on the question whether the practice is reconcileable with John's Gospel which seems to date the crucifixion of Christ on the 14th. See Introduction.

1. EUSEBIUS.

Eusebius, in his History of the Church (V. 22), gives a list of the bishops who held office in the tenth year of the reign of Commodus. He names Victor Bishop of Rome, Demetrius of Alexandria, Serapion of Antioch, Theophilus of Caesarea, Narcissus of Jerusalem, Bacchyllus of Corinth, and Polycrates of Ephesus. He adds that he has only recounted the names of the orthodox. He goes on to say:—

Eus. H. E. V. 23. *Ζητήσεως δῆτα κατὰ τούσδε οὐ σμικρᾶς ἀνακινηθείσης, ὅτι δὴ τῆς Ἀσίας ἁπάσης αἱ παροικίαι, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας, σελήνης τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην ᾤοντο δεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς παραφυλάττειν, ἐν ᾗ θύειν τὸ πρόβατον Ἰουδαίοις προηγόρευτο· ὡς δέον ἐκπαντὸς κατὰ ταύτην, ὁποίᾳ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἑβδομάδος περιτυγχάνοι, τὰς τῶν ἀσιτιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιεῖσθαι, οὐκ ἔθους ὄντος τοῦτον ἐπιτελεῖν τὸν τρόπον ταῖς ἀνὰ τὴν λοιπὴν ἅπασαν οἰκουμένην ἐκ-*

κλησίας ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως τὸ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο κρατῆσαν ἔτος φυλαττούσαις, ὡς μὴ δ' ἑτέρᾳ προσήκειν παρὰ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡμέραν τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύεσθαι. Σύνοδοι δὴ καὶ συγκροτήσεις ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ ταὐτὸν ἐγίνοντο, πάντες τε μιᾷ γνώμῃ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δόγμα τοῖς πανταχόσε διετυποῦντο, ὡς ἂν μὴ δ' ἐν ἄλλῃ ποτὲ τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐπιτελοῖτο τοῦ Κυρίου μυστήριον, καὶ ὅπως ἐν ταύτῃ μόνῃ τῶν κατὰ τὸ πάσχα νηστειῶν φυλαττόμεθα τὰς ἐπιλύσεις. Φέρεται δ' εἰσέτι νῦν τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην τηνικάδε συγκεκροτημένων γραφὴ, ὧν προὐτέτακτο Θεόφιλος τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ Νάρκισσος τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις· καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δὲ ὁμοίως ἄλλη περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ζητήματος, ἐπίσκοπον Βίκτορα δηλοῦσα· τῶν τε κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο, καὶ τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν δὲ παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει· ἔτι τε τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ὀσροηνὴν καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖσε πόλεις· καὶ ἰδίως Βακχύλλου τῆς Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου, καὶ πλείστων ὅσων ἄλλων, οἱ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν δόξαν τε καὶ κρίσιν ἐξενηνεγμένοι, τὴν αὐτὴν τέθεινται ψῆφον. Καὶ τούτων μὲν ἦν ὅρος εἷς, ὁ δεδηλωμένος.

C. 24. *Τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπισκόπων, τὸ πάλαι πρότερον αὐτοῖς παραδοθὲν διαφυλάττειν ἔθος χρῆναι διισχυριζομένων, ἡγεῖτο Πολυκράτης· ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ᾗ πρὸς Βίκτορα καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν διετυπώσατο γραφῇ, τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθοῦσαν παράδοσιν ἐκτίθεται διὰ τούτων· "Ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀραδιούργητον ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν, μήτε προστιθέντες, μήτε ἀφαιροῦμενοι. Καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μεγάλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηται, ἅτινα ἀναστήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν, καὶ ἀναστήσει πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Φίλιππον τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει, καὶ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ γεγηρακυῖαι παρθένοι. Καὶ ἡ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀναπαύεται· ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς, καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος· οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται."* [Then he enumerates those who agreed—Polycarp, Thrasæas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito the Eunuch—and adds:—] *"Οὗτοι πάντες ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαι-*

δεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,[1] μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες. Ἔτι δὲ κἀγὼ ὁ μικρότερος πάντων ὑμῶν Πολυκράτης, κατὰ παράδοσιν τῶν συγγενῶν μου, οἷς καὶ παρηκολούθησα τισὶν αὐτῶν· ἑπτὰ μὲν ἦσαν συγγενεῖς μου ἐπίσκοποι, ἐγὼ δὲ ὄγδοος· καὶ πάντοτε τὴν ἡμέραν ἤγαγον οἱ συγγενεῖς μου, ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ἤρνε τὴν ζύμην. . . ."

Upon this Victor, Bishop of the Church of Rome, endeavoured to cut off the churches of all Asia from the common unity, as being heterodox. But other bishops resisted him.

Ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος ἐκ προσώπου ὧν ἡγεῖτο κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστείλας, παρίσταται μὲν τῷ δεῖν ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι μυστήριον· τῷγε μὴν Βίκτορι προσηκόντως, ὡς μὴ ἀποκόπτοι ὅλας ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ, ἀρχαίου ἔθους παράδοσιν ἐπιτηρούσας, πλεῖστα ἕτερα παραινεῖ, καὶ αὐτοῖς δὲ ῥήμασι τάδε ἐπιλέγων· "Οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἡ ἀμφισβήτησις, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ τῆς νηστείας. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας· οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν. Καὶ τοιαύτη μὲν ποικιλία τῶν ἐπιτηρούντων, οὐ νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γεγονυῖα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν, τῶν παρὰ τὸ ἀκριβὲς, ὡς εἰκὸς, κρατούντων, τὴν καθ' ἁπλότητα καὶ ἰδιωτισμὸν συνήθειαν εἰς τὸ μετέπειτα πεποιηκότων. Καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον πάντες οὗτοι εἰρήνευσάν τε, καὶ εἰρηνεύομεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησι." Τούτοις καὶ ἱστορίαν προστίθησιν ἣν οἰκείως παραθήσομαι, τοῦτον ἔχουσαν τὸν τρόπον· "Ἐν οἷς καὶ οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς σὺ νῦν ἀφηγῇ.[2] Ἀνίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πίον, Ὑγινόν τε καὶ Τελεσφόρον καὶ Ξύστον, οὔτε αὐτοὶ ἐτήρησαν, οὔτε τοῖς μετ' αὐτῶν ἐπέτρεπον, καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες εἰρήνευον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο, ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καί τοι μᾶλλον ἐναντίον ἦν τὸ τηρεῖν τοῖς μὴ τηροῦσι. Καὶ οὐδέ ποτε διὰ τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο ἀπεβλήθησάν τινες, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ

[1] According to the Gospel as a whole.

[2] The Roman Bishops are supposed to have been: Xystus A.D. 116; Telesphorus, A.D. 129; Hyginus, A.D. 138; Pius, A.D. 142; Anicetus, A.D. 156; Soter, A.D. 168; Eleutherus, A.D. 173; Victor, A.D. 189; Zephyrinus, A.D. 201.

μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν. Καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιδημήσαντος ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου, καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὐθὺς εἰρήνευσαν περὶ τούτου τοῦ κεφαλαίου μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες εἰς ἑαυτούς. Οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πεῖσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκότα, οὔτε μὴν ὁ Πολύκαρπος τὸν Ἀνίκητον ἔπεισε τηρεῖν, λέγοντα τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων ὀφείλειν κατέχειν. Καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι, καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν, πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνην ἐχόντων καὶ τῶν τηρούντων καὶ τῶν μὴ τηρούντων."

C. 25. Irenaeus wrote letters also to other bishops on the question. The bishops of Palestine state that they kept the custom handed down to them by succession from the Apostles; and that the Christians of Alexandria observed the same day as they themselves did.

In another passage (IV. 26) Eusebius says that Melito Bishop of Sardis (A.D. 175) wrote a work on the Passover, beginning thus:— "*Ἐπὶ Σερουιλλίου Παύλου ἀνθυπάτου τῆς Ἀσίας, ᾧ Σάγαρις καιρῷ ἐμαρτύρησεν, ἐγένετο ζήτησις πολλὴ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, ἐμπεσόντος κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις . . .*" *Τούτου δὲ λόγου μέμνηται Κλήμης ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν ἰδίῳ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα λόγῳ, ὃν ὡς ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς τοῦ Μελίτωνος γραφῆς φησὶν ἑαυτὸν συντάξαι.*

2. HIPPOLYTUS, A.D. 220.

Ref. Haer. VIII. 18. *Ἕτεροι δέ τινες φιλόνεικοι τὴν φύσιν, ἰδιῶται τὴν γνῶσιν, μαχιμώτεροι τὸν τρόπον, συνιστάνουσι δεῖν τὸ πάσχα τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ πρώτου μηνὸς φυλάσσειν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ νόμου διαταγήν, ἐν ᾗ ἂν ἡμέρᾳ ἐμπέσῃ, ὑφορώμενοι τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐν νόμῳ,*[3] *ἐπικατάρατον ἔσεσθαι τὸν μὴ φυλάξαντα οὕτως ὡς διαστέλλεται, οὐ προσέχοντες ὅτι Ἰουδαίοις ἐνομοθετεῖτο τοῖς μέλλουσι τὸ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα ἀναιρεῖν, τὸ εἰς ἔθνη χωρῆσαν*

[3] Compare Num ix. 3. 13; Deut. v. 27.

καὶ πίστει νοούμενον, οὐ γράμμασι νῦν τιθούμενον· οὗ μιᾷ ταύτῃ προσέχοντες ἐντολῇ οὐκ ἀφορῶσιν εἰς τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὅτι διαμαρτύρομαι παντὶ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶ τοῦ πάντα[4] τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑτέροις οὗτοι συμφωνοῦσι πρὸς πάντα τὰ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδεδομένα.

3. THE PASCHAL CHRONICLE.[5]

Ἐν αὐτῇ οὖν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν ᾗ ἤμελλον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐσθίειν τὸ πάσχα, ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ ὁ Χριστὸς, θῦμα γενόμενος τοῖς μέλλουσι μεταλήψεσθαι τῆς πίστεως τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν μυστηρίου κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον τῷ μακαρίῳ Παύλῳ, "καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστὸς," καὶ οὐχ ὥς τινες ἀμαθίᾳ φερόμενοι διαβεβαιοῦνται ὡς φαγὼν τὸ πάσχα παρεδόθη· ὅπερ οὔτε παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων εὐαγγελίων μεμαθήκαμεν οὔτε τις τῶν μακαρίων ἡμῖν ἀποστόλων τι τοιοῦτον παραδέδωκεν. . . .—*Chron. Pasch.* P. 5, B. C.

Having repeated that Christ, being slain as the true Paschal Lamb on the 14th, could not have eaten the legal Passover before He suffered, the chronicler goes on to cite testimonies.

Ἱππόλυτος[6] τοίνυν ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας μάρτυς, ἐπίσκοπος γεγονὼς τοῦ καλουμένου Πόρτου πλησίον τῆς Ῥώμης, ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἁπάσας τὰς αἱρέσεις συντάγματι ἔγραψεν ἐπὶ λέξεως οὕτως. Ὁρῶ

[4] ὅλον Gal. v. 3.

[5] This is a Paschal computation (σύνταγμα περὶ τοῦ πάσχα or πασχάλιον), *i.e.* a rule for the celebration of the Passover. Such tables or calendars were not uncommon; and we read of one made by Hippolytus for a period of 16 years. The Festal letters of Athanasius (see before, page 13 and note 1) are instances of the pains that were taken about such subjects. The 'Paschal chronicle' with which we have here to do contains this tabular computation and also a Preface, long and mystical and of uncertain date. This Preface repeats over and over again that Jesus Christ, being the True Passover, was slain on the day when the Jews usually slew their passover viz. the fourteenth. The inference the author draws is that Christ could not have eaten the legal passover before he suffered. He quotes several early authors as testifying in his favour. From these the passages in our text are taken. The Paschal Chronicle (sometimes called Sicilian, because the MS was found in Sicily; sometimes the Alexandrian, because it was at first supposed to be written by Peter of Alexandria) seems to be of old date; but its oldest MS is of the tenth century. The Preface may be of about the seventh century. The Preface is therefore of late date and it is also anonymous. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, great stress has been laid upon it.

[6] This, though said to be from Hippolytus on Haeresies, is not found in that work as now in existence. Its genuineness therefore rests on the authority of the anonymous author who quotes it.

μὲν οὖν ὅτι φιλονεικίας τὸ ἔργον. Λέγει[7] γὰρ οὕτως· ἐποίησε τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔπαθεν· διὸ καμὲ δεῖ ὃν τρόπον ὁ Κύριος ἐποίησεν, οὕτω ποιεῖν. Πεπλάνηται δὲ μὴ γινώσκων ὅτι ᾧ καιρῷ ἔπασχεν ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ κατὰ νόμον πάσχα. Οὗτος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πάσχα τὸ προκεκηρυγμένον καὶ τὸ τελειούμενον τῇ ὡρισμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ.—P. 6, A. B.

Another short extract from Hippolytus "περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πάσχα," says: Ὁ πάλαι προειπὼν ὅτι Οὐκέτι φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα εἰκότως τὸ μὲν δεῖπνον ἐδείπνησεν πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν.[8] Οὐδὲ γὰρ καιρὸς ἦν τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ.

The Chronicle then proceeds:—

Καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος (A.D. 170) δὲ ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεραπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας, ὁ ἐγγὺς τῶν ἀποστολικῶν χρόνων γεγονὼς, ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα λόγῳ τὰ παραπλήσια ἐδίδαξε, λέγων οὕτως· Εἰσὶ τοίνυν οἳ δι' ἄγνοιαν φιλονεικοῦσι περὶ τούτων, συγγνωστὸν πρᾶγμα πεπονθότες· ἄγνοια γὰρ οὐ κατηγορίαν ἀναδέχεται ἀλλὰ διδαχῆς προσδεῖται· καὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι τῇ ιδ' τὸ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ Κύριος, τῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων αὐτὸς ἔπαθεν, καὶ διηγοῦνται Ματθαῖον οὕτω λέγειν ὡς νενοήκασιν· ὅθεν ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν, καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια.[9]

Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ γέγραφεν οὕτως· Ἡ ιδ' τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ Κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ παῖς Θεοῦ, ὁ δεθεὶς, ὁ δήσας τὸν ἰσχυρὸν, καὶ ὁ κριθεὶς κρίτης ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ παραδοθεὶς εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ, ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐπὶ κεράτων μονοκέρωτος, καὶ ὁ τὴν ἁγίαν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντηθείς, ὁ ἐκχέας ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πάλιν καθάρσια, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα, καὶ ὁ ταφεὶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα, ἐπιτεθέντος τῷ μνήματι τοῦ λίθου.

Next, Clement of Alexandria is cited as teaching to the same effect ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα λόγῳ, thus: Τοῖς μὲν οὖν παρεληλυθόσιν ἔτεσι τὸ θυόμενον πρὸς Ἰουδαίων ἤσθιεν ἑορτάζων ὁ

[7] λέγει sc. The Asiatic representative.

[8] This seems to contradict the Synoptists.

[9] On this and following extract see Donaldson, Christian Literature and Doctrine, III. 245 &c.

Κύριος πάσχα· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκίρυξεν αὐτὸς ὢν τὸ πάσχα, ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἀγόμενος, αὐτίκα ἐδίδαξε μὲν τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ τύπου τὸ μυστήριον τῇ ιγ', ἐν ᾗ καὶ πυνθάνονται αὐτοῦ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν; Ταύτῃ οὖν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς τῶν ἀζύμων καὶ ἡ προετοιμασία τῆς ἑορτῆς ἐγίνετο. Ὅθεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰκότως ὡς ἂν προετοιμαζομένους ἤδη ἀπονίψασθαι τοὺς πόδας πρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀναγράφει· πέπονθεν δὲ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, αὐτὸς ὢν τὸ πάσχα, καλλιερηθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, Ἀκολούθως ἄρα τῇ ιδ', ὅτε καὶ ἔπαθεν, ἔωθεν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῷ Πιλάτῳ προσαγαγόντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἀκωλύτως ἐσπέρας τὸ πάσχα φαγῶσι, ταύτῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ πᾶσαι συμφωνοῦσι καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια συνῳδά. Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις· τῇ γοῦν τρίτῃ ἀνέστη ἡμέρᾳ ἥτις ἦν πρώτη τῶν ἑβδομάδων τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τὸ δράγμα νενομοθέτητο προσενεγκεῖν τὸν ἱερέα.

4. EPIPHANIUS.

Epiphanius (Haeresies) treating of the Quartodecimans, says, *ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἔτους μίαν ἡμέραν τοῦ πάσχα οἱ τοιοῦτοι φιλονείκως ἄγουσι.*

Again: *κεχρημένοι τῷ ῥητῷ, ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ νόμος· ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος ὃς οὐ ποιήσει τὸ πάσχα τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνός.*

He says there was much dispute amongst the Quartodecimans as to the day for the Passover; and that the Acts of Pilate were cited as authority for the viii Kal. Apr. being the day of our Saviour's Passion. He adds that he has seen copies of the Acts of Pilate making the xv Kal. Apr. the date.

Again he says: *ἔδει γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ θύεσθαι κατὰ τὸν νόμον.*

He closes with an argument in favour of the usage of the Catholic Church, which observes also the seventh day, and says: *κέχρηται γὰρ οὐ μόνον τῇ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ἑβδομάδι τῇ κατὰ περίοδον ἀνακυκλουμένῃ τάξει τῶν τοῦ Σαββάτου ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν. . . .*

X.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 7. 2. *Εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, ἔπαθεν, ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς. . . .* (Acts x. 42. See below 2 Clem. 2. 1.)

2. Clement of Rome.

Ep. I. c. 2. 1. *Πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονευόμενοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες.* (Acts xx. 35.)

Ibid. c. 18. 1. *Τί δὲ εἴπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαβίδ; πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· "Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαβὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν."* (Acts xiii. 22; 1 Sam. xiii. 14.)

Ep. II. c. 1. 1. *Κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.* (Acts x. 42; compare 2 Tim. iv. 1 and 1 Pet. iv. 5.)

3. Hermas.

Vis. IV. 2. 4. *Πιστεύσας ὅτι δι' οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.* (Acts iv. 12.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

Magnes. 5. 1. *Ἐπεὶ οὖν τέλος τὰ πράγματα ἔχει, καὶ πρόκειται τὰ δύο ὁμοῦ, ὅ τε θάνατος καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον μέλλει χωρεῖν.* (Acts i. 25.)

Philad. 2. 2. *Πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι ἡδονῇ κακῇ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν τοὺς θεοδρόμους.* (Acts xx. 29.)

[1] Barnabas. Add as Echo c. 19. 8 (Acts iv. 32).

[1] Ignatius. Echoes:—Eph. 1. 1, comp. Acts xx. 28; Smyrn. 3. 3, comp. Acts x. 41.

5. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. 1. 2. *Ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου.* (Acts ii. 24.)

6. Martyrdom of Polycarp.[1]

C. 7. 1. *Κἀκεῖθεν δὲ ἠδύνατο εἰς ἕτερον χωρίον ἀπελθεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐβουλήθη, εἰπών· Τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ γενέσθω.* (Acts xxi. 14.)

7. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. *Ἄξιον δὲ ταῖς ἀποδοθείσαις τοῦ Παπία φωναῖς προσάψαι λέξεις ἑτέρας αὐτοῦ, δι' ὧν παράδοξά τινα ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλα, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως εἰς αὐτὸν ἐληλύθοντα. Τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν Ἱεραπολιν Φίλιππον τὸν ἀπόστολον ἅμα ταῖς θυγατράσι διατρῖψαι, διὰ τῶν πρόσθεν δεδήλωται . . . καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἕτερον παράδοξον περὶ Ἰοῦστον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Βαρσαβᾶν γεγονὸς, ὡς δηλητήριον φάρμακον ἐμπιόντος, καὶ μηδὲν ἀηδὲς διὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου χάριν ὑπομείναντος. Τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Ἰοῦστον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀνάληψιν τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀποστόλους μετὰ Ματθία στῆσαί τε καὶ ἐπεύξασθαι ἀντὶ τοῦ προδότου Ἰούδα ἐπὶ τὸν κλῆρον τῆς ἀναπληρώσεως τοῦ αὐτῶν ἀριθμοῦ, ἣ τῶν Πράξεων ὧδέ πως ἱστορεῖ γραφή· "Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσὴφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαβᾶν ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος, καὶ Ματθίαν· καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπον."* (Acts xxi. 8 &c.; i. 23, 24.)

8. Dionysius of Corinth.

Eus. H. E. IV. 23. *Δηλοῖ δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου προτραπεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι δεδηλωμένα, πρῶτος τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις παροικίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκεχείριστο.* (Acts xvii. 34.)

[1] Polyc. Echo:—Phil. 8. 2, comp. Acts v. 41.
[1] Mart. of Polyc. Echo:—c. 14. 1, comp. Acts iii. 26.

9. Justin Martyr.[1]

Apol. I. c. 49. *p.* 85 *A.* Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ, ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκήσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν, παραγενόμενον ἠγνόησαν, οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξελθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀπετάξαντο, καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν. (Acts xiii. 37 &c.)

Dial. c. 20. *p.* 237 *D.* Ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ τὰ λάχανα τοῦ χόρτου διακρίνομεν, μὴ πάντα ἐσθίοντες, οὐ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ κοινὰ ἢ ἀκάθαρτα οὐκ ἐσθίομεν, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ τὸ πικρὰ ἢ θανάσιμα ἢ ἀκανθώδη . . . (Acts x. 14.)

Dial. c. 68. *p.* 293 *C.* Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων· Πῶς οὖν ὁ λόγος λέγει τῷ Δαυὶδ ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ λήψεται ἑαυτῷ υἱὸν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ κατορθώσει αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ καθίσει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. (Acts ii. 30.)

Dial. c. 118. *p.* 346 *A.* Καὶ ὅτι κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ Χριστὸς, εἶπον ἐν πολλοῖς. (Acts x. 42.)

10. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 3. 4. Ὁ γὰρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χορηγῶν ὧν προσδεόμεθα, οὐδενὸς ἂν αὐτὸς προσδέοιτο τούτων ὧν τοῖς οἰομένοις διδόναι παρέχει αὐτός. (Acts xvii. 24.)

11. Letter from the Churches of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 2. Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τὰ δεινὰ διατιθέντων ἠὔ-

[1] Echoes:—Apol. I. c. 40. p. 78 E, comp. Acts iv. 27; Apol. I. c. 45. p. 82 D, comp. Acts iii. 21; Apol. I. c. 49. p. 85 A, comp. Acts xiii. 27, 48; Apol. I. c. 50. p. 86 B, comp. Acts i. 8, and de Resurrect. c. 9; Apol. I. c. 53. p. 88 B, comp. Acts xvii. 26; Apol. II. c. 10. p. 48 D, comp. Acts xvii. 23; Dial. c. 8. p. 225 C, comp. Acts xxvi. 29; Dial. c. 16. p. 234 B, comp. Acts vii. 52; Dial. c. 36. p. 254 C, comp. Acts xxvii. 22, also Dial. c. 76. p. 302 A; Dial. c. 39. p. 258 A, comp. Acts xxvi. 25; Dial. c. 120. p. 349 C, comp. Acts viii. 10; Cohort. ad Gent. c. 10. p. 11 B, comp. Acts vii. 21; ibid. c. 29. p. 28 E, comp. Acts vii. 24.

χοντο, καθάπερ Στέφανος ὁ τέλειος μάρτυς· "Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην." Εἰ δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν λιθαζόντων ἐδέετο, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν; (Acts vii. 60.)

12. Hegesippus.

Eus. H. E. II. 23. *Μάρτυς οὗτος ἀληθὴς Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι γεγένηται, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστι.* (Acts xx. 21.)

13. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

(See before, pp. 1. 2.)

14. Muratorian Canon.

(See before, p. 6.)

15. Acts of Paul and Thecla.[1]

C. 16. *Ὁ δὲ ἀνθύπατος ἔστησεν τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸν Παῦλον λέγων· Τίς εἶ, καὶ τί διδάσκεις; οὐ γὰρ μικρῶς σου κατηγοροῦσιν. Καὶ ἦρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ὁ Παῦλος λέγων· Εἰ ἐγὼ σήμερον ἀνακρίνομαι τί διδάσκω, ἄκουσον, ἀνθύπατε. Θεὸς ζῶν, Θεὸς ἐκδικήσεων, Θεὸς ζηλωτής, Θεὸς ἀπροσδεής, χρῄζων τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας ἔπεμψέν με ὅπως ἀπὸ τῆς φθορᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀκαθαρσίας ἀποστάσω αὐτοὺς καὶ πάσης ἡδονῆς καὶ θανάτου, ὅπως μὴ ἁμάρτωσιν· διὸ ἔπεμψεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα, ὃν ἐγὼ εὐαγγελίζομαι καὶ διδάσκω ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἔχειν τὴν ἐλπίδα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὃς μόνος συνεπάθησεν πλανωμένῳ κόσμῳ, ἵνα μηκέτι ὑπὸ κρίσιν ὦσιν, ἀνθύπατε, ἀλλὰ πίστιν ἔχωσιν καὶ φόβον Θεοῦ καὶ γνῶσιν σεμνότητος καὶ ἀγάπην ἀληθείας. Εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ τὰ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ μοι ἀνακεκαλυμμένα διδάσκω, τί ἀδικῶ; Ὁ δὲ ἀνθύπατος ἀκούσας ἐκέλευσεν δεθῆναι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν ἀποκατασταθῆναι, μέχρις οὗ εὐσχολήσας, φησίν, ἀκούσομαι αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελέστερον.* (Acts xxiv. 21; xxiii. 6; xvii. 3, 5, 30, 31.)

[1] "Acts of Paul and Thecla," a work of the second century, containing accounts of Paul's labours, which Tertullian (de bapt. c. 17) says was written by a presbyter who confessed that he manufactured it from love of Paul. According to Jerome it dates from the beginning of the second century.

16. Irenaeus.

(See before, p. 67.)

B. III. 14. § 1. Quoniam autem is Lucas inseparabilis fuit a Paulo, et cooperarius ejus in Evangelio, ipse facit manifestum, non glorians, sed ab ipsa productus veritate. Separatis enim, inquit, a Paulo, et Barnaba et Joanne, qui vocabatur Marcus, et cum navigassent Cyprum, "nos venimus in Troadem:" et cum vidisset Paulus per somnium virum Macedonem, dicentem; "Veniens in Macedoniam opitulare nobis, Paule;" statim, ait: "quaesivimus proficisci in Macedoniam, intelligentes quoniam provocavit nos Dominus evangelizare eis. Navigantes igitur a Troade, direximus navigium in Samothracen:" et deinceps reliquum omnem ipsorum usque ad Philippos adventum diligenter significat, et quemadmodum primum sermonem loquuti sunt: "Sedentes enim," inquit, "loquuti sumus mulieribus quae convenerant;" et quinam crediderunt, et quam multi. Et iterum ait: "Nos autem navigavimus post dies azymorum a Philippis, et venimus Troadem, ubi et commorati sumus diebus septem." Et reliqua omnia ex ordine cum Paulo refert, omni diligentia demonstrans et loca et civitates et quantitatem dierum, quoadusque Hierosolymam ascenderent: et quae illic contigerint Paulo, quemadmodum vinctus Romam missus est, et nomen centurionis qui suscepit eum, et parasema navium, et quemadmodum naufragium fecerunt, et in qua liberati sunt insula, et quemadmodum humanitatem ibi perceperunt, Paulo curante principem ipsius insulae, et quemadmodum inde Puteolos navigaverunt, et inde Romam pervenerunt, et quanto tempore Romae commorati sunt. Omnibus his cum adesset Lucas, diligenter conscripsit ea, uti neque mendax, neque elatus deprehendi possit, eo quod omnia haec constarent, et seniorem eum esse omnibus qui nunc aliud docent, neque ignorare veritatem. Quoniam non solum prosequutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli, et ipse autem Paulus manifestavit in epistolis, dicens: "Demas me dereliquit, et abiit Thessalonicam, Crescens in Galatiam, Titus in Dalmatiam: Lucas est mecum solus." Unde ostendit quod semper junctus ei et inseparabilis fuerit ab eo. Et iterum in ea epistola quae est ad Colossenses, ait: "Salutat vos Lucas medicus di-

lectus." Si autem Lucas quidem, qui semper cum Paulo praedicavit, et dilectus ab eo est dictus, et cum eo evangelizavit, et creditus est referre nobis Evangelium, nihil aliud ab eo didicit, sicut ex verbis ejus ostensum est, quemadmodum hi qui numquam Paulo adjuncti fuerunt, gloriantur abscondita et inenarrabilia didicisse sacramenta? — Quoniam autem Paulus simpliciter quae sciebat, haec et docuit, non solum eos qui cum eo erant, verum omnes audientes se, ipse facit manifestum. In Mileto enim convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso, et a reliquis proximis civitatibus, quoniam ipse festinaret Hierosolymis Pentecosten agere, multa testificatus eis, et dicens quae oportet ei Hierosolymis evenire, adjecit: "Scio quoniam jam non videbitis faciem meam etc." . . . Deinde significans futuros malos doctores, dixit: "Ego scio quoniam advenient post discessum meum lupi graves ad vos, non parcentes gregi etc." . . . Sic apostoli simpliciter, et nemini invidentes, quae didicerant ipsi a Domino, haec omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemini invidens, ea quae ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testificatur dicens: "Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi."

B. III. 15. § 1. Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscunt, quoniam aut reliquis verbis Evangelii, quae per solum Lucam in nostram venerunt agnitionem, renuntiare debent, et non uti eis; aut si illa recipiunt omnia, habent necessitatem recipere etiam eam testificationem, quae est de Paulo, dicente ipso, primum quidem Dominum ei de coelo locutum: "Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris? Ego sum Jesus Christus, quem tu persequeris:" deinde Ananiae, de eo dicente: "Vade, quoniam vas electionis mihi est iste, ut portet nomen meum in gentibus, et regibus, et filiis Israel. Ego enim demonstrabo ei ex ipso, quanta oporteat eum pati propter nomen meum." Qui igitur non recipiunt eum qui sit electus a Deo ad hoc, ut fiducialiter portet nomen ejus, quod sit missus ad quas praediximus gentes, electionem Domini contemnunt, et se ipsos segregant ab apostolorum conventu. Neque enim contendere possunt Paulum non esse apostolum, quando in hoc sit electus: neque Lucam mendacem esse possunt ostendere, veritatem nobis cum omni diligentia annuntiantem. Fortassis enim et propter

hoc operatus est Deus plurima Evangelii ostendi per Lucam, quibus necesse haberent omnes uti, ut sequenti testificationi ejus, quam habet de actibus et doctrina apostolorum, omnes sequentes, et regulam veritatis inadulteratam habentes, salvari possint. Igitur testificatio ejus vera, et doctrina apostolorum manifesta et firma, et nihil subtrahens, neque alia quidem in abscondito, alia vero in manifesto docentium.

17. Tatian.

Orat. c. Graec. c. 4. *p.* 144 *D. Δημιουργίαν τὴν ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ γεγενημένην χάριν ἡμῶν προσκυνεῖν οὐ θέλω. Γέγονεν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη δι᾽ ἡμᾶς· εἶτα πῶς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ὑπηρέτας προσκυνήσω; Πῶς δὲ ξύλα καὶ λίθους Θεοὺς ἀποφανοῦμαι; . . . ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον Θεὸν δωροδοκητέον· ὁ γὰρ πάντων ἀνενδεὴς, οὐ διαβλητέος ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν ὡς ἐνδεής.* (Acts xvii. 22-25.)

18. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 13. *Ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ οὐ δεῖται αἵματος, οὐδὲ κνίσσης, οὐδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων εὐωδίας, αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ τελεία εὐωδία, ἀνενδεὴς καὶ ἀπροσδεής.* (Acts xvii. 25.)

Ibid. c. 16. *Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὲν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἀσκεῖτε τὰς καταγωγὰς βασιλικάς· ὁ δὲ κόσμος οὐχ ὡς δεομένου τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονεν.* (Acts xvii. 25.)

19. Clement of Alexandria.

Adumbrat. in 1. *Petr. epist.* Sicut Lucas quoque et Actus Apostolorum stylo exsecutus agnosceret, et Pauli ad Hebraeos interpretatus epistolam.

Strom. V. 12. *p.* 696. *Καθὸ καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἀπομνημονεύει τὸν Παῦλον λέγοντα· Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ.* (Acts xvii. 22, 23.)

20. Tertullian.

De jejunio, c. 10. Porro cum in eodem *commentario Lucae,* et tertia hora orationis demonstretur, sub qua Spiritu Sancto initiati pro ebriis habeantur; et sexta, qua Petrus ascendit in superiora.

De praescript. haeret. c. 22. Et utique implevit (sc. Christus) repromissum, probantibus Actis Apostolorum descensum Spiritus Sancti. Quam scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritus Sancti esse possunt, qui necdum Spiritum Sanctum possunt agnoscere discentibus missum, sed nec ecclesiam se dicant defendere, qui quando et quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus, probare non habent.

Adv. Marcion. V. 2. 3. Exinde decurrens (sc. Paulus in epist. ad Galat.) ordinem conversionis suae, de persecutore in apostolum, scripturam Apostolicorum confirmat, apud quam ipsa etiam epistolae istius materia recognoscitur, intercessisse quosdam, qui dicerent circumcidi oportere, et observandam esse Moysi legem: tunc apostolos de ista quaestione consultos, ex auctoritate Spiritus renuntiasse, non esse imponenda onera hominibus quae patres ipsi non potuissent sustinere. Quodsi et ex hoc congruunt Paulo Apostolorum Acta, cur ea respuatis jam apparet, ut Deum scilicet non alium praedicantia quam creatorem, nec Christum alterius, quam creatoris, quando nec promissio Spiritus Sancti aliunde probetur exhibita, quam de instrumento Actorum.

De baptismo, c. 10. Adeo postea in Actis Apostolorum invenimus, quoniam qui Joannis baptismum habebant, non accepissent Spiritum Sanctum quem ne auditu quidem noverant.

21. Clementine Homilies.

Hom. III. 53. *Ἔτι μὴν ἔλεγεν· ἐγώ εἰμι περὶ οὗ Μωϋσῆς προεφήτευσεν εἰπών· προφήτην ἐγερεῖ ὑμῖν Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐμέ, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε κατὰ πάντα. Ὃς ἂν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου, ἀποθανεῖται.* (Acts iii. 22; vii. 37. Quotation of Deut. xviii. 15.)

22. Clementine Recognitions.

I. 10. Urgebat tamen profectionem dicens, se diem festum religionis suae, qui immineret, omnimodis apud Judaeam celebraturum, ibique de reliquo cum suis civibus ac fratribus permansurum, evidenter indicans, injuriae se horrore perculsum. (Acts xviii. 21.)

I. 40. Nos ergo primos elegit duodecim sibi credentes, quos Apostolos nominavit, postmodum alios septuaginta duos probatissimos discipulos, ut vel hoc modo recognita imagine Moysis crederet multitudo, quia hic est, quem praedixit Moyses venturum prophetam.

I. 60. Haec et his similia prosecutus siluit etiam Cananaeus. Post quem Barnabas qui et Matthias, qui in locum Judae subrogatus est apostolus, monere populum coepit, ne odio haberent Jesum neque blasphemarent eum. (Acts i. 26.)

I. 65. Gamaliel, princeps populi, adsurgens ait: Quiescite paullisper, O viri Israelitae, non enim advertitis tentationem quae imminet vobis, propter quod desinite ab hominibus istis, et si quidem humani consilii est quod agunt, cito cessabit, si autem a Deo est, cur sine causa peccatis nec proficitis quidquam, Dei enim voluntatem quis potest superare? Nunc ergo, quoniam quidem in vesperam vergitur dies, crastino hoc ipso in loco audientibus vobis, ego ipse cum istis disputabo, ut omnem errorem palam arguam, dilucideque confutem. (Acts v. 38, 39.)

I. 71. Cum autem vespera adfuisset, templum quidem sacerdotes claudunt; nos vero ad domum Jacobi regressi et pernoctantes ibi in oratione, ante lucem descendimus Hiericho ad quinque millia viri. Post triduum autem venit ad nos ex fratribus quidam a Gamaliele, de quo supra diximus, occultos nobis nuncios deferens, quod inimicus ille homo legationem suscepisset a Caipha pontifice, ut omnes qui crederent in Jesum, persequerentur et Damascum pergeret cum epistolis ejus, ut etiam inibi auxilio usus infidelium, fidelibus inferret exitium. (Acts ix. 1, 2.)

I. 72. Simonem quendam Samaraeum, magum plurimos nostrorum subvertere, adserentem se esse quendam Stantem, hoc est alio nomine, Christum, et virtutem summam excelsi Dei, qui

sit supra conditorem mundi, simulque mirabilia plurima ostendens alios dubitare, alios declinare fecerit ad se. (Acts viii. 10.)

23. Origen.

Ep. ad Afric. § 9. Tom. I. p. 22. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 69.) *Καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ Στέφανος μαρτυρῶν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς, καὶ ταῦτα λέγει· Τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγείλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου, οὗ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδόται καὶ φονεῖς ἐγένεσθε; Ἀληθεύειν μὲν γὰρ τὸν Στέφανον πᾶς ὁστισοῦν τῶν προσιεμένων τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμολογήσει.* (Acts vii. 52.)

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 9.)

C. Cels. VI. 11. Tom. I. p. 638. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 1308.) *Καὶ Ἰούδας δὲ ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, ὡς ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔγραψεν, ἐβουλήθη ἑαυτόν τινα εἰπεῖν μέγαν, καὶ πρὸ ἐκείνου Θευδᾶς.*

Hexapl. In Psalm. II. v. 8. (Tom. II. 537.) Migne VI. p. 575. *Λυσὶν ἐντυχόντες Ἑβραϊκοῖς ἀντιγράφοις, ἐν μὲν τῷ ἑτέρῳ εὕρομεν ἀρχὴν δευτέρου ψαλμοῦ ταῦτα· ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ συνῆπτο τῷ πρώτῳ. Καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, ἐλέγετο εἶναι τοῦ πρώτου ψαλμοῦ. Ὡς γὰρ γέγραπται, φησὶν, ἐν πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ Υἱός μου εἶ σύ. Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ δὲ ἀντίγραφα δεύτερον εἶναι τοῦτον μηνύει. Ἐν μέντοι τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ οὐδενὶ τῶν ψαλμῶν ἀριθμὸς παράκειται, πρῶτος εἰ τύχοι ᾗ β′ ᾗ γ′.*

24. Apostolical Constitutions.

II. 6. *Ὡς που λέγει ὁ Λουκᾶς· Ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν.*[1] (Acts i. 1.)

25. Eusebius.

H. E. II. 17. *Τοιγαροῦν κἂν ταῖς ὁμολογουμέναις τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεσιν ἐμφέρεται, ὅτι δὴ πάντες οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων*

[1] Another reading is: Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ διδάσκαλος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἤρξατο πρῶτον ποιεῖν καὶ τότε διδάσκειν.

γνώριμοι, τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις διαπιπράσκοντες, ἐμέριζον ἅπασι καθ' ὃ ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν, ὡς μὴ δὲ εἶναί τινα ἐνδεῆ παρ' αὐτοῖς· Ὅσοι γοῦν κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, ὡς ὁ λόγος φησὶ, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων, ἐτίθεσάν τε παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὥστε διαδίδοσθαι ἑκάστῳ καθ' ὃ ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.

Ibid. III. 4. *Ὅτι μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν κηρύσσων ὁ Παῦλος, τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καταβέβληται θεμελίους, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ γένοιτ' ἂν φωνῶν, καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν ἱστόρησεν.*

Ibid. *Λουκᾶς δὲ . . . ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑποδείγματα θεοπνεύστοις καταλέλοιπε βιβλίοις· τῷ δὲ Εὐαγγελίῳ, . . . καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεσιν, ἃς οὐκέτι δι' ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς παραλαβὼν, συνετάξατο.*

Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

26. Jerome.

De Vir. Illustr. c. 7. See before under Luke, where also see other references.

[*Note.* The Acts of the Apostles has been, as the foregoing testimonies show, an accepted book from the earliest times. The Manicheans (see below) objected to it because of its account of the coming of the Holy Ghost. The Marcionites (see above, under Tertullian) could not accept it because of its testimony to the God of the Creation being the Father of Christ Jesus. The Ebionites (Epiph. Haer. 30. 16) rejected it because of its recording the admission of Gentiles into the church without circumcision; the Severians (Eus. H. E. IV. 29) would not have Paul's Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles because these books were in conflict with their ascetic principles. Chrysostom in his Homilies on Acts (Hom. 1) says Πολλοῖς τουτὶ τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ' ὅτι ἔνι, γνώριμόν ἐστιν, οὔτε αὐτὸ, οὔτε ὁ γράψας αὐτὸ καὶ συνθείς, but he is pointing at the popular neglect of the book, not at any deliberate rejection. Photius: Quaest. Amphiloch. 145 says τὸν δὲ συγγραφέα τῶν Πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγουσι τὸν Ῥώμης, ἄλλοι δὲ Βαρνάβαν, καὶ Λουκᾶν τὸν Εὐαγγελιστήν. But this statement as to doubt of the authorship is not supported by the testimonies of early writers.

XI.

THE EPISTLES.

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III.)

Eusebius.

H. E. III. 3.

Περὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων.

Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηνται συγγράμμασι. Τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν, οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν. Ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν. Τό γε μὴν τῶν ἐπικεκλημένων αὐτοῦ Πράξεων, καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ὠνομασμένον Εὐαγγέλιον, τό τε λεγόμενον αὐτοῦ Κήρυγμα, καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκάλυψιν, οὐδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μή τε ἀρχαίων μή τε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.[1] *Προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας, προὔργου ποιησόμαι σὺν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ὑποσημήνασθαι, τίνες τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων ὁποίαις κέχρηνται τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, τίνα τε περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων γραφῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων αὐτοῖς εἴρηται. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, ὧν μόνην μίαν γνησίαν ἔγνων ἐπιστολὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι πρεσβυτέροις ὁμολογουμένην, τοσαῦτα. Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρό-*

[1] Eusebius speaks too strongly here. Clem. Alex. in his Hypotyposes gave a brief account of the "Apocalypse of Peter" among other Antilegomena (see Eus. H. E. VI. 14). In his Stromata he frequently quotes the "Preaching of Peter" (see Strom. 1. 29. 182. p. 427), &c.; and Origen (on John, Tom. XIII. c. 17. p. 226) refers to it as quoted by Heracleon, and speaks of the time which might be occupied by a controversy on its genuineness. Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. Extra Can. Rec. IV. p. 66) goes too far in saying Origen "*decernere noluit*" περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου, πότερόν ποτε γνήσιόν ἐστιν ἢ νόθον ἢ μικτόν, for Origen merely puts the enquiry aside because of the time it would consume. What Origen thus says is consistent with his explicit statement (περὶ ἀρχῶν Prolog. p. 49) that the "Preaching of Peter" was neither written by Peter nor by any other inspired man. Clement's quotations are overlooked in Eusebius's statement in the text. There is an obscure reference to what Peter and Paul taught the Corinthians and the Romans in words ascribed to Dionysius of Corinth in Eus. H. E. II. 25.

δηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες. Ὅτι γε μήν τινες ἠθετήκασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν. Καὶ τὰ περὶ ταύτης δὲ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν εἰρημένα κατὰ καιρὸν παραθήσομαι. Οὐδὲ μὴν τὰς λεγομένας αὐτοῦ Πράξεις ἐν ἀναμφιλέκτοις παρείληφα. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος, ἐν ταῖς ἐπὶ τέλει προσρήσεσι τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, μνήμην πεποίηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ Ἑρμᾶ, οὗ φασὶν ὑπάρχειν τὸ τοῦ Ποιμένος βιβλίον, ἰστέον ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μέν τινων ἀντιλέλεκται, δι' οὓς οὐκ ἂν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, ὑφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαιότατον οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς, κέκριται. Ὅθεν ἤδη καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ἴσμεν αὐτὸ δεδημοσιευμένον, καὶ τῶν παλαιοτάτων δὲ συγγραφέων κεχρημένους τινὰς αὐτῷ κατείληφα. Ταῦτα εἰς παράστασιν τῶν τε ἀναντιρρήτων καὶ τῶν μὴ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογουμένων θείων γραμμάτων εἰρήσθω.

XII.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III.)

1. Clement of Rome.[2]

Ep. I. c. V. 4. . . . *Πέτρον, ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ' ἕνα οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἔδειξεν, ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φυγαδευθείς, λιθασθείς, κήρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.*[3]

[1] Paul's Epistles are supposed by many to have been originally more numerous than they now are: and some have sought to show what specific Epistles were lost. An Epistle to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16) (see Muratorian Canon before, p. 7) has been supplied by tradition, but is obviously spurious (see Lightfoot's 'Colossians,' p. 353). An Epistle to the Corinthians is supposed to have been lost; some say there are two lost (see 1 Cor. iii. 9, and for the spurious Epistles of the Corinthians to St Paul and of St Paul to the Corinthians, as translated by Lord Byron from the Armenian, see Stanley's 'Corinthians,' p. 609). There is also supposed to have been another to the Philippians now lost (Phil. iv. 16; iii. 1, 18—compare Polycarp, § 3). Certain letters of Paul and Seneca have been manufactured (see Lightfoot's 'Philippians,' p. 268, &c.). Although Basilides is said to have been the first to reject the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews, it appears that Marcion, who was first to make a formal collection of the letters of Paul, was the first to reject these four Epistles formally. He also called Ephesians by the name of Laodiceans. Baur divided the Pauline Epistles into three classes, the first (or Homologoumena) containing only Galatians and 2 Corinthians and Romans; the second (Antilegomena) containing Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon, and Thessalonians. The Pastoral Epistles he regarded as the third (or spurious) class. The phraseology of this division is from Eusebius; Baur attempts to show that its substance corresponds with Marcion's division. Hebrews Baur does not reckon among Paul's Epistles at all.

[2] See a discussion of questions regarding this and several following sections in 'Introduction to Pauline Epistles,' by Paton J. Gloag, D.D. Edin. 1874.

[3] This passage has been the occasion of infinite debate. It seems to confirm the tradition of Paul's missionary journeys after his first imprisonment, and thus leaves time for his writing the Pastoral Epistles. The Muratorian fragment speaks of Paul's journey to Spain (see p. 6), and the τέρμα τῆς δύσεως in Clement may refer to Spain. Those who refuse to admit this make the "extreme west" to be

2. Tatian.

Eus. H. E. IV. 29. *Τοῦ δὲ ἀποστόλου φασὶ τολμῆσαί τινας αὐτὸν μεταφράσαι φωνὰς, ὡς ἐπιδιορθούμενον αὐτῶν τὴν τῆς φράσεως σύνταξιν.*

3. Caius.

Eus. H. E. VI. 20. *Ἦλθε δ' εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαΐου λογιοτάτου ἀνδρὸς διάλογος, ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ Ζεφυρῖνον πρὸς Πρόκλον τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως ὑπερμαχοῦντα κεκινημένος, ἐν ᾧ τῶν δι' ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτειάν τε καὶ τόλμαν ἐπιστομίζων τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μόνων ἐπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν.*

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 59. Caius sub Zephyrino Romanae urbis episcopo, i. e. sub Antonio, Severi filio, disputationem adversus Proculum, Montani sectatorem, valde insignem habuit, arguens eum temeritatis, super nova prophetia defendenda: et in eodem volumine epistolas quoque Pauli tredecim tantum enumerans decimam quartam, quae fertur ad Hebraeos, dicit non ejus esse: sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur.

4. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

(See before, pp. 1, 2.)

an expression denoting Rome itself. Another main point of controversy is the connection between "reaching the extreme west" and "bearing testimony before rulers." Some make the two clauses synchronous, so as to read that Paul's martyrdom took place in the "extreme west," wherever it was. Others regard the three clauses depending on διδάξας, ἐλθών, and μαρτυρήσας respectively, as making three distinct and independent statements. The punctuation varies accordingly. Lightfoot prints ἐλθών·, while Bryennios, Hilgenfeld, and Gebhardt and Harnack have not even a comma after the word. The punctuation in our text seems to be the most natural. On the controversy as regards the second imprisonment, see the two sides well represented in Meyer's Commentary—one by Meyer himself, Einl. in den Brief an die Röm. § 1. p. 12; and the other by Huther, Einl. in die Pastoralbriefe, § 3. p. 25 (Ed. 1859). See also the commentaries of the editors named above.

5. Muratorian Canon.

(See before, p. 7.)

6. Origen.

C. Cels. III. 20. (Opp. t. I. p. 458.) *Καί φαμεν τοῖς ὁμονοοῦσι τῷ Κέλσῳ, ὅτι οὐδεμίαν ἄρα φανταζόμενος σοφίαν ὁ Παῦλος ὑπερέχουσαν, ἐπηγγέλλετο σοφίαν λαλεῖν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις· ἐπειδὰν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ θρασὺ φήσῃ, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἔχων σοφὸν ταῦτα ἐπηγγέλλετο· ἀνταποκρινούμεθα αὐτῷ, λέγοντες· Πρῶτον σαφήνισον τοῦ ταῦτα λέγοντος τὰς ἐπιστολάς· καὶ ἀνατενίσας τῷ βουλήματι ἑκάστης ἐν αὐταῖς λέξεως (φερ᾽ εἰπεῖν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, καὶ πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς, καὶ τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, καὶ Φιλιππησίους, καὶ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους), ἀμφότερα δεῖξον, καὶ ὅτι νενόηκας τοὺς Παύλου λόγους, καὶ ὅτι παραστῆσαι εὐήθεις τινὰς ἢ ἠλιθίους. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἐπιδῷ ἑαυτὸν τῇ μετὰ τοῦ προσέχειν ἀναγνώσει, εὖ οἶδ᾽ ὅτι ἢ θαυμάσεται τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἐν ἰδιωτικῇ λέξει μεγάλα περινοοῦντος, ἢ μὴ θαυμάσας, αὐτὸς καταγέλαστος φανεῖται· εἴτε διηγούμενος ὡς νενοηκὼς τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἢ καὶ ἀντιλέγειν καὶ ἀνατρέπειν πειρώμενος ἃ ἐφαντάσθη αὐτὸν νενοηκέναι.*

7. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 3. (See before, p. 207.)

Ibid. II. 22. *Τούτου δὲ Φῆστος ὑπὸ Νέρωνος διάδοχος πέμπεται, καθ᾽ ὃν δικαιολογησάμενος ὁ Παῦλος δέσμιος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἄγεται. Ἀρίσταρχος αὐτῷ συνῆν, ὃν καὶ εἰκότως συναιχμάλωτόν που τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀποκαλεῖ. Καὶ Λουκᾶς ὁ καὶ τὰς Πράξεις τι᾽ν ἀποστόλων γραφῇ παραδοὺς, ἐν τούτοις κατέλυσε τὴν ἱστορίαν, διετίαν ὅλην ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης τὸν Παῦλον ἄνετον διατρῖψαι, καὶ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον ἀκωλύτως κηρῦξαι ἐπισημηνάμενος. Τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπολογησάμενον αὖθις ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος διακονίαν λόγος ἔχει στείλασθαι τὸν ἀπόστολον, δεύτερον δ᾽ ἐπιβάντα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει τῷ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν τελειωθῆναι μαρτυρίῳ. Ἐν ᾧ δεσμοῖς ἐχόμενος τὴν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δευτέραν ἐπιστολὴν συντάττει, ὅμου σημαίνων τήν τε προτέραν αὐτῷ γενομένην ἀπολογίαν καὶ τὴν παραπόδας τελείωσιν. Λέχου δὴ καὶ τούτων τὰς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας·*

"Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου,"

φησὶν,

"ἀπολογίᾳ οὐδείς μοι συμπαρεγένετο, ἀλλὰ πάντες με ἐγκατέλιπον (μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθείη), ὁ δὲ Κύριός μου παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέ με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ, καὶ ἀκούσωσι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος."

Σαφῶς δὲ παρίστησι διὰ τούτων, ὅτι δὴ τὸ πρότερον, ὡς ἂν τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ πληρωθείη, ἐρρύσθη ἐκ στόματος λέοντος, τὸν Νέρωνα ταύτῃ ὡς ἔοικε διὰ τὸ ὠμόθυμον προσειπών. Οὐκ οὖν ἐξῆς προστέθεικε παραπλήσιόν τι, τῷ,

"Ῥύσεταί με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος."

Ἑώρα γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τὴν ὅσον οὔπω μέλλουσαν αὐτοῦ τελευτήν. Διό φησιν ἐπιλέγων τῷ,

"καὶ ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος," τὸ,

"Ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον,

σημαίνων τὸ παραυτίκα μαρτύριον, ὃ καὶ σαφέστερον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ προλέγει γραφῇ φάσκων·

"Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφέστηκεν."

Νῦν μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐπιστολῆς τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, τὸν Λουκᾶν μόνον γράφοντι αὐτῷ συνεῖναι δηλοῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν προτέραν ἀπολογίαν οὐδὲ τοῦτον. Ὅθεν εἰκότως τὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον ὁ Λουκᾶς περιέγραψε τὸν χρόνον, τὴν μέχρις ὅτε τῷ Παύλῳ συνῆν ἱστορίαν ὑφηγησάμενος. Ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῖν εἴρηται παρισταμένοις, ὅτι μὴ καθ' ἣν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἀνέγραψεν ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ Παύλου τὸ μαρτύριον αὐτῷ συνεπεράνθη. Εἰκός γε τοι κατὰ μὲν ἀρχὰς ἠπιώτερον τοῦ Νέρωνος διακειμένου ῥᾷον τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος τοῦ Παύλου καταδεχθῆναι ἀπολογίαν. Προελθόντος δὲ εἰς ἀθεμίτους τόλμας, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιχειρηθῆναι.

Ibid. II. 25. Παῦλος δὴ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι, καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦνται. Καὶ πιστοῦται γε τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἡ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου εἰς δεῦρο κρατήσασα ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτόθι κοιμητηρίων πρόσρησις. Οὐδὲν δ' ἧττον καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ, Γάϊος ὀνόματι, κατὰ

Ζεφυρῖνον Ῥωμαίων γεγονὼς ἐπίσκοπον· ὃς δὴ Πρόκλῳ τῆς κατα Φρύγας προϊσταμένῳ γνώμης ἐγγράφως διαλεχθείς, αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν τόπων ἔνθα τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατέθειται, φησίν·

"Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι. Ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικάνον, ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὠστίαν, εὑρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἱδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν."

Ὡς δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄμφω καιρὸν ἐμαρτύρησαν, Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος ἐγγράφως Ῥωμαίοις ὁμιλῶν ὧδέ πως παρίστησιν·

"Ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοσαύτης νουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. Καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες, ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν."

8. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 5. Quia in Actibus Apostolorum plenissime de ejus conversatione scriptum est, hoc tantum dicam, quod post passionem Domini vicesimo quinto anno, i. e. secundo Neronis, eo tempore quo Festus procurator Judaeae successit Felici, Romam vinctus mittitur, et biennium in libera manens custodia, adversus Judaeos de adventu Christi quotidie disputavit. Sciendum autem in prima satisfactione, necdum Neronis imperio roborato, nec in tanta erumpente scelera, quanta de eo narrant historiae, Paulum a Nerone dimissum, ut Evangelium Christi in Occidentis quoque partibus praedicaretur, sicut ipse scribit in secunda epistola ad Timotheum, eo tempore quo et passus est, de vinculis dictans epistolam: "In prima mea satisfactione nemo mihi affuit, sed omnes me dereliquerunt: non eis imputetur. Dominus autem mihi affuit, et confortavit me, ut per me praedicatio compleretur, et audirent omnes gentes: et liberatus sum de ore leonis." Manifestissime leonem propter crudelitatem Neronem significans. Et in sequentibus: "Liberatus sum de ore leonis." Et statim: "Liberabit me Dominus ab omni opere malo, et salvabit me in regnum suum coeleste," quod scilicet praesens

sibi sentiret imminere martyrium. Nam et in eadem Epistola praemiserat: "Ego enim jam immolor, et tempus resolutionis meae instat." Hic ergo quarto decimo Neronis anno, eodem die quo Petrus Romae, pro Christo capite truncatur, sepultusque est in Via Ostiensi, anno post passionem Domini tricesimo septimo. Scripsit autem novem ad septem Ecclesias Epistolas: ad Romanos unam; ad Corinthios duas; ad Galatas unam; ad Ephesios unam; ad Philippenses unam; ad Colossenses unam; ad Thessalonicenses duas; praeterea ad discipulos suos, Timotheo duas, Tito unam, Philemoni unam. Epistola autem quae fertur ad Hebraeos, non ejus creditur, propter styli sermonisque dissonantiam; sed vel Barnabae, juxta Tertullianum; vel Lucae evangelistae, juxta quosdam; vel Clementis Romanae postea Ecclesiae episcopi, quem aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone. Vel certe quia Paulus scribebat ad Hebraeos, et propter invidiam sui apud eos nominis, titulum in principio salutationis amputaverit. Scripserat ut Hebraeus Hebraice, id est, suo eloquio disertissime, ut ea quae eloquenter scripta fuerant in Hebraeo, eloquentius verterentur in Graecum: et hanc causam esse, quod a ceteris Pauli Epistolis discrepare videatur. Legunt quidam et ad Laodicenses, sed sub omnibus exploditur.

XIII.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

1. Barnabas.

C. 4. 12. Ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον. Ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται. (Rom. ii. 11; see Gal. ii. 6 and 1 Pet. i. 17.)

C. 13. 7. Τί οὖν λέγει τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, ὅτε μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραὰμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας τῷ Θεῷ. (Rom. iv. 11; comp. Gen xvii. 5.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 32. 1. Ὁ ἄν τις καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον εἰλικρινῶς κατανοήσῃ, ἐπιγνώσεται μεγαλεῖα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δεδομένων δωρεῶν. Ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Λευῖται πάντες οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. (Rom. ix. 4.)

C. 35. 5. Ἀποῤῥίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν, πλεονεξίαν, ἔρεις, κακοηθείας τε καὶ δόλους, ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιὰς, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν, κενοδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν. Ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν· οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτὰ, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.[2] (Rom. i. 29 &c. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 20.)

C. 38. 2. Ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τημελείτω τὸν ἀσθενῆ, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενὴς ἐντρεπέτω τὸν ἰσχυρόν. (Rom. xiv. 1.)

C. 46. 7. Ἱνατί διέλκομεν καὶ διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ

[1] In addition to the following extracts, compare as echoes more or less distinct: C. 5. 4. ζῆλον καὶ ἔριν (Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20). C. 16. 2. ἀλαξονείας καὶ ὑπερηφανίας (Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2).

[2] This is perhaps rather an echo than a quotation.

καὶ στασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον, καὶ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀπόνοιαν ἐρχόμεθα ὥστε ἐπιλαθέσθαι ἡμᾶς ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων. (Rom. xii. 5.)

Second Epistle.

C. 1, 8.[1] Ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς. (Rom. iv. 17; comp. 1 Cor. i. 29.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

Ad Ephes. c. 18. Ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου. (Rom. i. 3, 4.)

Ad Ephes. c. 20. Ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τῷ κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ, τῷ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱῷ Θεοῦ. (Rom. i. 4.)

Ad Philadelph. c. 11. Κἀγὼ τῷ Θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἐδέξασθε αὐτοὺς, ὡς καὶ ὑμᾶς ὁ Κύριος. (Rom. xv. 7.)

Ad Smyrn. c. 1. Ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ. (Rom. i. 3, 4.)

4. Polycarp.[1]

Ad Philippens. c. 3. 3. Προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης, τῆς εἰς Θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον. Ἐὰν γάρ τις τούτων ἐντὸς ᾖ, πεπλήρωκεν ἐντολὴν δικαιοσύνης· ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακρὰν ἐστι πάσης ἁμαρτίας. (Rom. xiii. 9, 10.)

C. 6. 1. Ἀλλὰ προνοοῦντες ἀεὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς, κ.τ.λ. (Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21.)

C. 6. 2. Ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι. (Rom. xiv. 10, 12; comp. 2 Cor. v. 10.)[2]

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: C. 3, 1 (Rom. iii. 2); C. 1, 3 and 15, 2 (Rom. i. 27); C. 8, 2 (Rom. ix. 21).

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echoes: Ad Eph. 1. εὐλογημένῃ πληρώματι (Rom. xv. 29). Ad Magnes. 14. 1. Θεοῦ γέμετε (Rom. xv. 14). Ad Philadelph. 11. 1. ἐδέξασθε αὐτούς (Rom. xv. 7).

[1] Polycarp. Echo: Ad Phil. C. 1, 2. (καρποφορεῖ, κ.τ.λ.) comp. Rom. vii. 5.

[2] These words occur at the close of a warning against censorious judging similar to the early part of Romans xiv.

Mart. Polyc. c. 10. 2. Ἔφη ὁ ἀνθύπατος· Πεῖσον τὸν δῆμον. Ὁ δὲ Πολύκαρπος εἶπεν· Σὲ μὲν καὶ λόγου ἠξίωσα· δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ πρόσῆκον, τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἡμᾶς, ἀπονέμειν· ἐκείνους δὲ οὐχ ἡγοῦμαι ἀξίους τοῦ ἀπολογεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς. (Rom. xiii. 1; Titus iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13, &c.)

Ibid. c. 20. 2. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰσαγαγεῖν ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι καὶ δωρεᾷ εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν, διὰ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος, μεγαλωσύνη εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. (Rom. xvi. 25; John i. 18.)

5. Justin Martyr.[1]

Dial. c. 23. *p.* 241 *B.* (comp. also Dial. c. 11. p. 229 A, and c. 92. p. 320 A.) Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀβραὰμ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ὢν διὰ τὴν πίστιν, ἣν ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, ἐδικαιώθη καὶ εὐλογήθη, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ σημαίνει· τὴν δὲ περιτομὴν εἰς σημεῖον, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ εἰς δικαιοσύνην ἔλαβεν, ὡς καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ καὶ τὰ πράγματα ἀναγκάζει ἡμᾶς ὁμολογεῖν. (Rom. iv. 10, 3, 11.)

Dial. c. 27. *p.* 244 *D.* Πάντες γὰρ ἐξέκλιναν, βοᾷ, πάντες ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός. Ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν, τάφος ἀνεῳγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν, σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν.[2] (Rom. iii. 11-17.)

Dial. c. 47. *p.* 266 *D.* Ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμετρον τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. (Rom. ii. 4; comp. also Titus iii. 4.)

6. Letter to Diognetus.[1]

C. 9. 3. Τί γὰρ ἄλλο τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἠδυνήθη καλύψαι

[1] Justin. Compare as echoes of Paul's teaching, not always of special passages: Apol. I. 13. p. 60 D (by faith gaining incorruption); Dial. c. 13. p. 229 D (by faith cleansed through the blood of Christ and His death who died for this); Dial. c. 32. p. 249 D (the seed left for salvation = Rom. ix. 27, xi. 5); Dial. c. 39. p. 257 D (quotation regarding Elias, as in Rom. xi. 3); Dial. c. 42. p. 260 D (quotation of Psalm xix. and Isaiah liii. as in Rom. x. 16-18); Dial. c. 44. p. 262 D (Jewish pride in being Abraham's seed); Dial. c. 131. p. 360 D (called through Christ to salvation prepared by the Father).

[2] Compare Ps. xiii. 3; lii. 4; v. 10; cxxxix. 4; Isaiah lix. 7, 8.

[1] Diognetus. For the relation between this letter and the Pauline Epistles

ἢ ἐκείνου δικαιοσύνη; ἐν τίνι δικαιωθῆναι δυνατὸν τοὺς ἀνόμους ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ὦ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς, ὦ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας, ὦ τῶν ἀπροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν, ἵνα ἀνομία μὲν πολλῶν ἐν δικαίῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαιώσῃ. (Comp. Rom. v. and Rom. xi. 33.)

7. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 1. Ὄντως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. (Rom. viii. 18.)

8. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

(See before, pp. 1. 2.)

9. Muratorian Canon.

(See before, p. 7.)

10. The Presbyters[1]

WHOSE TESTIMONY IRENAEUS REPORTS.

Irenaeus adv. Haer. IV. 27. § 1. Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant . . .

§ 2. *Omnes enim homines egent gloria Dei,* justificantur autem non a semetipsis. (Rom. iii. 23.)

Ibid. Non debemus ergo, inquit ille Senior, superbi esse, neque reprehendere veteres; sed ipsi timere, ne forte post agnitionem Christi agentes aliquid quod non placeat Deo, remissionem ultra non habeamus delictorum, sed excludamur a regno ejus. Et ideo Paulum dixisse: *Si enim naturalibus ramis non pepercit,*

as regards its use of detached phrases, and its "whole sections constructed with manifest regard to passages in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians," see Westcott, Canon, Part. I. § 5. Cotterill's "Peregrinus Proteus" disparages the letter: see before, page 65, note 1.

[1] The Presbyters. See p. 71, note 1.

ne forte nec tibi parcat, qui cum esses oleaster, insertus es in pinguedinem olivae, et socius factus es pinguedinis ejus.[2]

11. Tatian.

Orat. c. Graec. c. 4. *p.* 144 *D. Τοῦτον διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως αὐτοῦ ἴσμεν, καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀόρατον τοῖς ποιήμασι καταλαμβανόμεθα.* (Rom. i. 20.)

12. Irenaeus.

L. 3. *c.* 16. § 3. Hoc ipsum interpretatus est Paulus,[1] scribens ad Romanos: "Paulus apostolus Jesu Christi, praedestinatus in evangelium Dei, quod promisit per prophetas suos in Scripturis sanctis de Filio suo, qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem, qui praedestinatus est Filius Dei in virtute, per Spiritum sanctificationis ex resurrectione mortuorum, Jesu Christi Domini nostri." Et iterum ad Romanos scribens de Israel, dicit: "Quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in saecula." (Rom. i. 1; ix. 5.)

L. 3. *c.* 16. § 9. Et Paulus autem his consentiens, Romanos alloquens, ait: "Multo magis hi, qui abundantiam gratiae et justitiae accipiunt in vitam, regnabunt per unum Jesum Christum." (Rom. v. 17.)

13. Athenagoras.

Legatio, p. 10. See before, p. 181.

Ibid. c. 13. *p.* 13 *D. Τί δέ μοι ὁλοκαυτώσεων, ὧν μὴ δεῖται ὁ Θεός; Καίτοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν.* (Rom. xii. 1.)

Ibid. c. 34. *p.* 37 *C. Οἱ γὰρ ἀγορὰν στήσαντες πορνείας, καὶ καταγωγὰς ἀθέσμους πεποιημένοι τοῖς νέοις πάσης αἰσχρᾶς ἡδονῆς καὶ μηδὲ τῶν ἀρσένων φειδόμενοι, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσι τὰ δεινὰ κατεργαζόμενοι, ὅσων σεμνότερα καὶ εὐειδέστερα σώματα παντοίως αὐτὰ ὑβρίζοντες, ἀτιμοῦντες καὶ τὸ ποιητὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλόν.* (Rom. i. 24 &c.)

[2] Two sentences before this an echo of Rom. vi. 9 occurs. Comp. Routh's Rel. Sac. 1. 52.

[1] Irenaeus. The first quotation naming Paul.

14. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. I. 14. *p.* 79. *Ὁ γὰρ δοὺς στόμα εἰς τὸ λαλεῖν, καὶ πλάσας οὖς εἰς τὸ ἀκούειν, καὶ ποιήσας ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸ ὁρᾶν, ἐξετάσει τὰ πάντα καὶ κρινεῖ τὸ δίκαιον, ἀποδιδοὺς ἑκάστῳ κατὰ ἀξίαν τῶν μισθῶν. Τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν διὰ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν ζητοῦσιν τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν δωρήσεται ζωὴν αἰώνιον, χαρὰν, εἰρήνην, ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ πλήθη ἀγαθῶν, ἃ οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Τοῖς δὲ ἀπίστοις, καὶ καταφρονηταῖς καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ἐπὰν ἐμφύρωνται μοιχείαις, καὶ πορνείαις, καὶ ἀρσενοκοιτίαις, καὶ πλεονεξίαις, καὶ ταῖς ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις, ἔσται ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός, θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία· καὶ τὸ τέλος τοὺς τοιούτους καθέξει πῦρ αἰώνιον.* (Rom. ii. 6, &c.)

Ibid. III. 14. *p.* 126. *Καὶ διδάσκει ἀποδιδόναι πᾶσι τὰ πάντα, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν, τῷ τὸν φόβον τὸν φόβον, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον, μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφελεῖν ἢ μόνον τὸ ἀγαπᾶν πάντας.* (Rom. xiii. 7, 8.)

15. Clement of Alexandria.

Paedag. I. 8. § 70. (p. 140.) *"Ἰδὲ οὖν," φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, "χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας, ἀποτομίαν, ἐπὶ δέ σε, χρηστότητα, ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι," τουτέστι τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν πίστει.* (Rom. xi. 22.)

Strom. III. 11. § 75. (p. 544.) *Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ γράφει, "Οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; . . . ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας,"* ἕως, *"μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ."* (Rom. vi. 2, 6, 13.)

16. Tertullian.

De corona, c. 6. Nec natura vos, inquit, docet? ut cum ad Romanos, natura facere dicens nationes ea quae sunt legis, et legem naturalem suggerit, et naturalem legalem. (Rom. c. ii.)

Scorpiace, c. 13. Sicut et ad Romanos (sc. Paulus inquit): "Non solum autem, verum etiam exultantes in pressuris, certi

quod pressura tolerantiam perficit, tolerantia vero probationem, probatio autem spem, spes vero non confundit." (Rom. v. 3-5.)

Adv. Praxean. c. 13. Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus: Ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in aevum omne.

CHAPTERS XV. AND XVI.

17. Origen.

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. Tom. IV. p. 687. (Migne, IV. 1290.) Caput hoc (xvi. 25-27) Marcion, a quo Scripturae evangelicae atque apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac Epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco ubi scriptum est: "Omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est" (xiv. 23), usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (xvi. 25-27) diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus (xiv. 23), hoc est: "Omne autem, quod non est ex fide, peccatum est," statim cohaerens habetur: "Ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare." Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.[1]

[1] The only other passage from ancient authors that can be quoted against the genuineness of the 15th and 16th chapters is Tertullian adv. Marc. c. 5, 14, who says, "Bene autem quod et in clausula (xiv. 10) *tribunal Christi* comminatur." This is needlessly supposed to indicate that the words were at the very end of the Epistle in Tertullian's opinion. But on internal grounds many in recent times have rejected those chapters, or received them only in part. Some (including Griesbach) put the Doxology (xvi. 25-27) after xiv. 23. Others reject it also. Baur (Paulus, Part II. c. 3) finds in those two chapters the work of a disciple of Paul who wished to soften the keen Anti-Judaism of the Apostle by something more palatable to the Judaizers. Davidson, Int. to N. T. Vol. I. p. 134, rejects chapter xvi. and the Doxology, but retains chapter xv. Hilgenfeld, Einl. p. 320, retains both chapters, but rejects the Doxology (p. 326). Semler, Eichhorn, Schulz, Ewald, and others, consider the chapters (or large portions of them) Pauline, but out of their place in this Epistle. So also Reuss (Gesch. § 111) says, the whole of the last chapter is a separate letter of commendation for Phoebe to take to some place or other—Ephesus? See external testimonies to the chapters in Tisch., Nov. Test., and outline of recent opinions in Hilgenfeld's Einleitung and Mangold's Bleek's Einleitung.

XIV.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I, II.)

1. Barnabas.

C. 4. 9. See also c. 6. 5. *Γράφειν ἐσπούδασα, περίψημα*[1] *ὑμῶν.* (1 Cor. iv. 13.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 20. 4. *Τῇ κυοφοροῦσα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἰδίοις καιροῖς τὴν πανπληθῆ ἀνθρώποις τε καὶ θηρσὶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ζώοις ἀνατέλλει τροφήν.* (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 38.)

C. 24. 1. *Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιδείκνυται διηνεκῶς ἡμῖν τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι, ἧς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας.* (1 Cor. xv. 20-23.)

C. 24. 5. *Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν γὴν ἕκαστον τῶν σπερμάτων ἄτινα πεσόντα εἰς τὴν γὴν ξηρὰ καὶ γυμνὰ διαλύεται, κ.τ.λ.* (1 Cor. xv. 26; Mat. xiii. 3.)

C. 34. 8. *Λέγει γάρ· Ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη ὅσα ἡτοίμασε τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν.* (1 Cor. ii. 9; comp. Is. lxiv. 4.)[2]

C. 37. 4. *Οἱ μεγάλοι δίχα τῶν μικρῶν οὐ δύνανται εἶναι, οὔτε οἱ μικροὶ δίχα τῶν μεγάλων· σύγκρασίς τις ἐστὶν ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἐν τούτοις χρῆσις. Λάβωμεν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν. Ἡ κεφαλὴ δίχα τῶν ποδῶν οὐδέν ἐστιν, οὕτως οὐδὲ οἱ πόδες δίχα τῆς κεφαλῆς·*

[1] Corinthians. The genuineness of this Epistle is not disputed.

[1] Barnabas. περίψημα is a word frequently used by the early fathers. Its strong figure seems to have laid hold of them.

[1] Clement. Add as echoes or suggestions—some of many—in the Preface, κλητοῖς ἡγιασμένοις (1 Cor. i. 1); c. 5. 5, βραβεῖον, (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 14); c. 19. 1, 2 (1 Cor. ix. 24, and Heb. xii. 1).

[2] See Lightfoot's note in loc., and comp. below on Hegesippus.

τὰ δὲ ἐλάχιστα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν ἀναγκαῖα καὶ εὔχρηστά ἐστιν ὅλῳ τῷ σώματι. Ἀλλὰ πάντα συμπνεῖ, καὶ ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρῆται εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. (1 Cor. xii. 12, &c.)

C. 47. 1. Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; Ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. (1 Cor. iii. 13, &c.)

C. 48. 6. Καὶ ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν, καὶ μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. (1 Cor. x. 24.)

C. 49. 1. Ὁ ἔχων ἀγάπην ἐν Χριστῷ ποιησάτω τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραγγέλματα. Τὸν δεσμὸν τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ τίς δύναται ἐξηγήσασθαι; Τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς καλλονῆς αὐτοῦ τίς ἀρκετὸς ἐξειπεῖν; Τὸ ὕψος, εἰς ὃ ἀνάγει ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνεκδιήγητόν ἐστιν. Ἀγάπη κολλᾷ ἡμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ· ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν· ἀγάπη πάντα ἀνέχεται, πάντα μακροθυμεῖ· οὐδὲν βάναυσον ἐν ἀγάπῃ, οὐδὲν ὑπερήφανον· ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει, ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει, ἀγάπη πάντα ποιεῖ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ· ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· δίχα ἀγάπης οὐδὲν εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν τῷ Θεῷ. Ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς ὁ δεσπότης· διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. Ὁρᾶτε ἀγαπητοί, πῶς μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη, καὶ τῆς τελειότητος αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξήγησις. (1 Cor. xiii.)

Second Epistle.[1]

C. 9. 3. Δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς ὡς ναὸν Θεοῦ φυλάσσειν τὴν σάρκα. (1 Cor. vi. 19.)

C. 11. 7. Ἐὰν οὖν ποιήσωμεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰσήξομεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ληψόμεθα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἃς οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

C. 14. 5. Οὔτε ἐξειπεῖν τις δύναται οὔτε λαλῆσαι ἃ ἑτοίμασεν ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ. (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

[1] Compare as echoes: C. 1. 8, comp. 1 Cor. i. 29 (see on Rom. iv. 17). C. 5. 1. (ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) comp. 1 Cor. v. 10. C. 5. 6. (Christians strangers in the world) 1 Cor. vii. 29-31.

3. Hermas.

Sim. V. 7. 2. *Ἐὰν μιάνῃς τὴν σάρκα σου, μιανεῖς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· ἐὰν δὲ μιάνῃς τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐ ζήσῃ.* (1 Cor. iii. 17.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

Ad Ephes. c. 2. 2. *Πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ κατηρτισμένοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, κατὰ πάντα ἦτε ἡγιασμένοι.* (1 Cor. i. 10.)

Ad Ephes. c. 8. 2. *Οἱ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πράσσειν οὐ δύνανται, οὐδὲ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά.* (1 Cor. ii. 14.)

Ad Ephes. c. 16. 1. *Μὴ πλανᾶσθε, ἀδελφοί μου· οἱ οἰκοφθόροι βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.* (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Ad Ephes. c. 18. 1. *Περίψημα τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ σταυροῦ, ὅ ἐστιν σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία, καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ συζητητής; ποῦ καύχησις τῶν λεγομένων συνετῶν;* (1 Cor. i. 18-24.)

Ad Magnes. c. 10. 2. *Ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην, τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.* (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.)

Ad Roman. c. 5. 1. *Ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ, διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, δεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστι στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα· οἷς καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον μαθητεύομαι, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι.* (1 Cor. iv. 2-4; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23 &c.)

Ad Roman. c. 9. 2. *Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄξιός εἰμι, ὢν ἔσχατος αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκτρωμα. Ἀλλ' ἠλέημαί τις εἶναι, ἐὰν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω.* (1 Cor. xv. 8-10; 1 Cor. vii. 25; comp. 1 Tim. i. 13, 16.)

Ad Philadelph. 7. 1. *Εἰ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα μέ τινες ἠθέλησαν πλανῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν.*

[1] Compare as echoes: Ad Eph. 2. 2, κατηρτισμένοι, κ.τ.λ. comp. 1 Cor. i. 10. Ad Eph. 4. 2, μέλη (1 Cor. vi. 15). Ibid. 8. 1, περίψημα (1 Cor. iv. 13), comp. 18. 1. Ibid. 13. 1, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (1 Cor. xi. 20), comp. 5. 3. Ad Trall. 12. 3, ἀδόκιμος (1 Cor. ix. 27). Ad Rom. 4. 3, ἐλεύθερος (1 Cor. ix. 1; vii. 22). Ibid. 5. 1, θηριομαχῶ (1 Cor. xv. 32).

Οἶδεν γὰρ, πόθεν ἔρχεται, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει. (1 Cor. xiv. 25.)

Ad Smyrn. c. 11. 1. *Ἡ προσευχὴ ὑμῶν ἀπῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας· ὅθεν δεδεμένος θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς, πάντας ἀσπάζομαι, οὐκ ὢν ἄξιος ἐκεῖθεν εἶναι, ἔσχατος αὐτῶν ὤν· κατὰ θέλημα δὲ κατηξιώθην, οὐκ ἐκ συνειδότος, ἀλλ' ἐκ χάριτος Θεοῦ, ἣν εὔχομαι τελείαν μοι δοθῆναι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω.* (1 Cor. xv. 8-10; comp. 1 Tim. i. 13, 16.)

5. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. c. 5. 3. *Καὶ οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε μαλακοὶ, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα.* (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Ibid. c. 11. 2. Si quis non abstinuerit se ab avaritia, ab idololatria coinquinabitur, et tanquam inter gentes judicabitur qui ignorant judicium domini.[2] (1 Cor. v. 11; comp. Ephes. v. 5; Col. iii. 5.)

Ibid. "Aut nescimus, quia sancti mundum judicabunt?" Sicut Paulus docet. (1 Cor. vi. 2.)

6. Martyrdom of Polycarp.

C. 2. 3. *Πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν γὰρ εἶχον φυγεῖν τὸ αἰώνιον καὶ μηδέποτε σβεννύμενον πῦρ, καὶ τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀνέβλεπον τὰ τηρούμενα τοῖς ὑπομείνασιν ἀγαθὰ, ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.*[1] (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

7. Justin Martyr.[1]

Apol. I. 19. *p.* 65 *E. Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον λογίσασθε ὅτι διαλυθέντα καὶ δίκην σπερμάτων εἰς γῆν ἀναλυθέντα τὰ ἀνθρώπεια*

[1] Polycarp. Compare as Echoes: Phil. 3. 1, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 28; 11. 4, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 26.

[2] This and the following passage are only found in the Latin translation.

[1] Martyrd. of Polyc. This prophecy is used of the future not of the spiritual state in this passage; which is not the scripture sense.

[1] Justin. Compare as Echoes: Apol. I. 19. p. 65 E, σώματα . . . ἀφθαρσίαν

σώματα κατὰ καιρὸν προστάξει Θεοῦ ἀναστῆναι, καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι οὐκ ἀδύνατον. (1 Cor. xv. 53.)

Apol. I. 60. *p.* 93 *D.* *Ὡς συνεῖναι οὐ σοφίᾳ ἀνθρωπείᾳ ταῦτα γεγονέναι, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει Θεοῦ λέγεσθαι.* (1 Cor. ii. 4.)

Dial. c. 14. *p.* 231 *D.* *Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀζύμων, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς κακῆς ζύμης ἔργα πράττητε.* (1 Cor. v. 8.)

Dial. c. 39. *p.* 258 *A.* *Οἳ καὶ λαμβάνουσι δόματα ἕκαστος ὡς ἄξιοί εἰσι, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνει συνέσεως πνεῦμα, ὁ δὲ βουλῆς, ὁ δὲ ἰσχύος, ὁ δὲ ἰάσεως, ὁ δὲ προγνώσεως, ὁ δὲ διδασκαλίας, ὁ δὲ φόβου Θεοῦ.* See also Dial. c. 87. p. 314 B D for further comment on Isaiah xi. 2. [comp. also Cohort. ad Gentiles c. 32.] (1 Cor. xii. 7-10.)

Dial. c. 41. *p.* 260 *A.* *Τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν.* Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 24; Luke xxii. 19.

Dial. c. 111. *p.* 338 *C.* *Ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ τυθεὶς ὕστερον.* (1 Cor. v. 7.)

8. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 5. 15. *Λοιδοροῦνται καὶ εὐλογοῦσιν.* (1 Cor. iv. 12.)

C. 12, 5. *Ἦν δύναμιν ἐνιδὼν ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν τε ἄνευ ἀληθείας προστάγματος εἰς ζωὴν ἀσκουμένην γνῶσιν μεμφόμενος, λέγει· ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ.* (1 Cor. viii. 1.)

9. The Presbyters

WHOSE TESTIMONY IRENAEUS REPORTS.

Irenaeus adv. Haer. IV. 27. 3. Et hoc autem Apostolum in Epistola quae est ad Corinthios, manifestissime ostendisse, di-

ἐνδύσασθαι, so also Apol. I. 52. p. 86 B, ἐνδύσει ἀφθαρσίαν [and Cohort. ad Gentiles c. 35 Piety not in word but in deed 1 Cor. iv. 20] [and De Resur. c. 10 (1 Cor. xv. 53)]; Dial. c. 35 and c. 51 (prediction of heresies, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 19, and see before, p. 125, note 1); Dial. c. 39. p. 258 A (the gifts of the spirit); Dial c. 41. p. 261 A (many members and one body) 1 Cor. xii. 12.

centem: Nolo enim vos ignorare, fratres, quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, et omnes in Mose baptizati sunt in nube et in mari, &c. 1 Cor. x. 1-11. (See also § 2 for 1 Cor. x. 11.)

10. Hegesippus.

Extract from Stephanus Gobarus in Photius, Bibl. [see Routh's Rel. Sac. Vol. I. p. 219]. After quoting *τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη* Stephanus Gobarus proceeds *Ἡγήσιππος μέν τοι . . . ματὴν μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.* (1 Cor. ii. 9; comp. Mat. xiii. 16.) See Lightfoot, Galatians, 2nd Ed., p. 320 and note. Hegesippus is reasoning against a misuse of the quotation; is not disputing its authority, as Baur would have it. See Routh, Rel. Sac., Vol. I. p. 281.

11. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon.

See before, pp. 1, 2, 6, 7.

12. Tatian.[1]

Oratio ad Graecos, c. 15. *p.* 25 *B. Τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον τῆς συστάσεως εἶδος εἰ μὲν ὡς ναὸς ἦ, κατοικεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ βούλεται Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πρεσβεύοντος πνεύματος.* (1 Cor. iii. 16.)

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 12. *p.* 547. *Τατιανὸν οἶμαι τὸν Σύρον τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμᾶν δογματίζειν. Γράφει γοῦν κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ "Συμφωνία μὲν οὖν ἁρμόζει προσευχῇ, κοινωνία δὲ φθορᾶς λύει τὴν ἔντευξιν." Πάνυ γοῦν δυσωπητικῶς διὰ τῆς συγχωρήσεως εἴργει, πάλιν γὰρ "ἐπὶ ταὐτὸ" συγχωρήσας "γενέσθαι, διὰ τὸν σατανᾶν καὶ τὴν ἀκρασίαν," τὸν πεισθησόμενον "δυσὶ κυρίοις μέλλειν δουλεύειν" ἀπεφήνατο, διὰ μὲν συμφωνίας Θεῷ, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀσυμφωνίας ἀκρασίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ διαβόλῳ." Ταῦτα δέ φησι τὸν ἀπόστολον*

[1] There is probably an echo of 1 Cor. ii. 14 in Tatian's Oratio ad Graecos c. 15 where he distinguishes ψυχικοί from πνεύματι Θεοῦ φρουρούμενοι.

ἐξηγούμενος, σοφίζεται δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν δι᾽ ἀληθοῦς ψεῦδος κατασκευάζων. (1 Cor. vii. 5.)

Iren. adv. haeres. III. 23. 8. Tatianus . . . tentans et subinde uti hujusmodi a Paulo assidue dictis: Quoniam "in Adam omnes morimur;" ignorans autem, quoniam "ubi abundavit peccatum, superabundavit gratia." (1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. xv. 20.)[2]

13. Athenagoras.

De resurrect. mort. c. 18. *Οὐ γὰρ σώζεται τὸ κατ᾽ ἀξίαν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ· διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς μὲν ἀθέους καὶ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν καὶ κακίαν ἐπιτηδεύοντας μέχρι τελευτῆς διατελεῖν κακῶν ἀπειράτους, καὶ τοὐναντίον τοὺς κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἐξητασμένον τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον ἐπιδειξαμένους ἐν ὀδύναις ζῆν, ἐν ἐπηρείαις, ἐν συκοφαντίαις, αἰκίαις τε καὶ παντοίαις κακοπαθείαις. . . . Εὔδηλον παντὶ τὸ λειπόμενον, ὅτι δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ σκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἵνα, ζωοποιηθέντων ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρωθέντων καὶ πάλιν ἑνωθέντων τῶν κεχωρισμένων ἢ καὶ πάντη διαλελυμένων, ἕκαστος κομίσηται δικαίως ἃ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὰ, εἴτε κακά.* (1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Cor. v. 10.)

Ibid. c. 19. *Εἰ μὲν γὰρ μηδεμία μηδαμοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώποις πεπραγμένων γίνοιτο κρίσις, οὐδὲν ἔξουσι πλεῖον τῶν ἀλόγων ἄνθρωποι· μᾶλλον δὲ κἀκείνων πράξουσιν ἀθλιώτερον, οἱ τὰ πάθη δουλαγωγοῦντες καὶ φροντίζοντες εὐσεβείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἢ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς, ὁ δὲ κτηνώδης βίος ἄριστος, ἀρετὴ δὲ ἀνόητος, δίκης δὲ ἀπειλὴ γέλως πλατὺς, τὸ δὲ πᾶσαν θεραπεύειν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθὸν τὸ μέγιστον, δόγμα δὲ κοινὸν τούτων ἁπάντων καὶ νόμος εἷς τὸ τοῖς ἀκολάστοις καὶ λάγνοις φίλον. Φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν· αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν.* (1 Cor. xv. 30 &c. Comp. Isa. xxii. 13.)

Legatio, c. 12. *Εἶθ᾽ οἱ μὲν τὸν βίον τοῦτον νομίζοντες, Φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν, καὶ τὸν θάνατον βαθὺν ὕπνον καὶ λήθην τιθέμενοι (ὕπνω καὶ θανάτω διδυμάονε) πιστεύονται θεοσεβεῖν.* (1 Cor. xv. 32. Comp. Isa. xxii. 13.)

[2] See Otto's note on this passage. Otto's Tatian, p. 168.

14. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. I. 2. *p.* 70. *Δεῖξον οὖν καὶ σὺ σεαυτὸν, εἰ οὐκ εἶ μοιχὸς, εἰ οὐκ εἶ πόρνος, εἰ οὐκ εἶ κλέπτης, εἰ οὐκ εἶ ἅρπαξ, εἰ οὐκ εἶ ἀποστερητὴς, εἰ οὐκ εἶ ἀρσενοκοίτης, εἰ οὐκ εἶ ὑβριστὴς, εἰ οὐκ εἶ λοίδορος, εἰ οὐκ ὀργίλος, εἰ οὐ φθονερὸς, εἰ οὐκ ἀλαλαζὼν, εἰ οὐχ ὑπερόπτης, εἰ οὐ πλήκτης, εἰ οὐ φιλάργυρος, εἰ οὐ γονεῦσιν ἀπειθὴς, εἰ οὐ τὰ τέκνα σου πωλεῖς. Τοῖς γὰρ ταῦτα πράσσουσιν ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐμφανίζεται, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον ἑαυτοὺς καθαρίσωσιν ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ.* (1 Cor. vi. 9.)

Ibid. I. 13. *p.* 77. *Τί δὲ καὶ οὐχὶ ἡ τῶν σπερμάτων καὶ καρπῶν γινομένη ἐξανάστασις, καὶ τοῦτο εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Εἰ γὰρ τύχοι εἰπεῖν, κόκκος σίτου ἢ τῶν λοιπῶν σπερμάτων, ἐπὰν βληθῇ εἰς τὴν γῆν, πρῶτον ἀποθνήσκει καὶ λύεται, εἶτα ἐγείρεται, καὶ γίνεται στάχυς.* (1 Cor. xv. 36, 37.)

15. Irenaeus.

B. III. 11. 9. In ea enim epistola quae est ad Corinthios, de propheticis charismatibus diligenter loquutus est, et scit viros et mulieres in ecclesia prophetantes. (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5.)

16. Clement of Alexandria.

Paedag. I. 6. *p.* 117. *Σαφέστατα γοῦν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἀπήλλαξεν ἡμᾶς τῆς ζητήσεως ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ ὧδέ πως γράφων· Ἀδελφοὶ, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσὶν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε.*[1] (1 Cor. xiv. 20.)

17. Tertullian.

De praescript. c. 33. Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis.

[1] Clement goes on to cite 1 Cor. xiii. 11, and recurs to it in c. 34. His quotations from 1 Cor. are numerous.

XV.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.)

1. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 5. 5. See before, p. 209. (2 Cor. xii. 20.)

Second Epistle.[2]

2. Ignatius.[1]

3. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 2. 2. *Ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ, ἐὰν ποιῶμεν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα.* (2 Cor. iv. 14.)

Ibid. c. 4. 1. *Ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης.* (2 Cor. vi. 7.)

Ibid. c. 6. 1. See before, under Romans, (2 Cor. viii. 21 and Rom. xii. 17.)

4. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 5. 8. *Ἐν σαρκὶ τυγχάνουσιν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατὰ σάρκα ζῶσιν. Ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται· πείθονται τοῖς ὡρισμένοις νόμοις, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις βίοις νικῶσι τοὺς νόμους· ἀγαπῶσι πάντας, καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων διώκονται· ἀγνοοῦνται, καὶ κατακρίνονται· θανατοῦνται, καὶ ζωοποιοῦνται· πτωχεύουσι, καὶ πλουτίζουσι πολλούς· πάντων ὑστεροῦνται, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι περισσεύουσιν· ἀτιμοῦνται, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀτιμίαις δοξάζονται· βλασφημοῦνται, καὶ δικαιοῦνται· λοιδοροῦνται, καὶ εὐλογοῦσιν· ὑβρίζονται, καὶ*

[1] Compare as Echoes c. 30, 6, self praise, (2 Cor. x. 17, 18; Rom. ii. 29); c. 36, 2, ἐνοπτριζόμεθα (2 Cor. iii. 18).

[2] Compare as Echoes c. 1, 2 (2 Cor. ix. 6); c. 2, 4 (2 Cor. vi. 18).

[1] Ignatius. Echo—Trall. 3. 3 φείδομαι (2 Cor. xii. 6).

τιμῶσιν· ἀγαθοποιοῦντες, ὡς κακοὶ κολάζονται· κολαζόμενοι χαίρουσιν, ὡς ζωοποιούμενοι. (2 Cor. x. 3; vi. 8-10.)

5. Athenagoras.

De resurrect. mort. c. 18. (See before, under 1 Corinthians.

6. Theophilus.[1]

Ad Autolyc. I. 2. *p.* 70. *Ἑαυτοὺς καθαρίσωσιν ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ.* (2 Cor. vii. 1.)

Ibid. I. 7. *p.* 74. *Ὅταν ἀπόθῃ τὸ θνητὸν, καὶ ἐνδύσῃ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, τότε ὄψῃ κατὰ ἀξίαν τὸν Θεόν.* (2 Cor. v. 4.)

Ibid. III. 4. *p.* 119. *Φρόνιμος γὰρ ὢν ἡδέως μωρῶν ἀνέχῃ.* (2 Cor. xi. 19.)

7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon.

See before, pp. 1, 2, 6, 7.

8. Irenaeus.

B. III. 7. 1. Quod autem dicunt, aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse: "In quibus Deus saeculi hujus excaecavit mentes infidelium;" et alterum quidem Deum esse saeculi hujus dicunt, alterum vero qui sit super omnem principatum, et initium, et potestatem: non sumus nos in causa, si hi, qui quae super Deum sunt mysteria scire se dicunt, ne quidem legere Paulum sciunt. (2 Cor. iv. 4.)

B. IV. 28. 3. Nam et apostolus ait in epistola secunda ad Corinthios: "Quoniam Christi suavis odor sumus Deo, et in his qui salvi fiunt, et in his qui pereunt: quibusdam quidem odor mortis in mortem, quibusdam autem odor vitae in vitam." (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.)

9. The Presbyters

whose testimony Irenaeus reports.

Iren. V. 5. 1. *Διὸ καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, τῶν ἀπο-*

[1] Compare as Echo: II. 1, ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ (2 Cor. xi. 6).

στόλων μαθηταὶ, τοὺς μετατεθέντας ἐκεῖσε μετατεθῆναι· δικαίοις γὰρ ἀνθρώποις καὶ πνευματοφόροις ἡτοιμάσθη ὁ παράδεισος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος εἰσκομισθεὶς ἤκουσεν ἀῤῥητα ῥήματα, ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ παρόντι, κἀκεῖ μένειν τοὺς μετατεθέντας ἕως συντελείας προοιμιαζομένους τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν. (2 Cor. xii. 4.)

10. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Strom. IV. 16. *p.* 607. *Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς γνώσεως ὁ ἀπόστολος. Τὴν δὲ κοινὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς πίστεως "ὄσμην γνώσεως" εἴρηκεν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους.* (2 Cor. ii. 14.) *"Ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει," μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον ἐπιστροφήν.* (2 Cor. iii. 14.)

11. Tertullian.

De pudicit. c. 13. Revera enim suspicantur apostolum Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios eidem fornicatori veniam dedisse quem in prima dedendum Satanae in interitum carnis pronuntiarit,[1] impium patris de matrimonio haeredem, quasi vel ipsum postea stilum verterit scribens: "Si quis autem contristavit, non me contristavit; sed ex parte, ne vos onerem omnes. Satis est talis increpatio quae a multis fit. Uti e contrario malitis vos donare et advocare, ne forte abundantiore tristitia devoretur ejusmodi. Propter quod oro vos, constituatis in eum dilectionem. In hoc enim et scripsi, uti cognoscam probationem vestram, quod in omnibus obauditis mihi. Si cui autem donaveritis, et ego. Nam et ego si quid donavi, donavi in persona Christi, ne fraudemur a Satana: quoniam non ignoramus injectiones ejus." (2 Cor. ii. 6-11.)

[1] In the immediately preceding sentence Clement quotes 2 Cor. i. 12 verbatim "ἡ γὰρ καύχησις κ.τ.λ." reading (as Lachmann did) ἁγιότητι for ἁπλότητι of the common text. It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. See four quotations in c. 131 alone. That in the text is given as naming an Epistle by its number.

[1] Tertullian. 1 Cor. v. 5.

XVI.

GALATIANS.

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.)

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 19. 8. *Κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσιν τῷ πλησίον σου.* (Gal. vi. 6.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 49. 6. *Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.* (Gal. i. 4.)

Second Epistle.

C. 2. 1. Isaiah liv. 1 quoted (see Gal. iv. 27).

C. 9. 7. *Ὡς ἔχομεν καιρὸν τοῦ ἰαθῆναι, ἐπιδῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεραπεύοντι Θεῷ, ἀντιμισθίαν αὐτοῦ διδόντες.* (Gal. vi. 10.)

C. 17. 3. *Πυκνότερον προσερχόμενοι πειρώμεθα προκόπτειν ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τοῦ Κυρίου.* (Gal. i. 14.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

4. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. c. 3. 2. *Οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν.* (Gal. iv. 26.)

[1] Barnabas. Compare as Echo c. 21. 7, ἀναπληροῦτε πᾶσαν ἐντολήν (Gal. vi. 2).

[1] Clement. Compare as Echoes c. 2. 1, παθήματα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν (Gal. iii. 1); c. 5. 2. στύλοι (Gal. ii. 9); c. 56. 1, treatment of the erring (Gal. vi. 1).

[1] Ignatius. Compare as Echoes:—Magnes. 8. 1, comp. Gal. v. 4. Trall. 10, comp. Gal. ii. 21. Philadelph. 1. 1, comp. Gal. i. 1. Ibid. 9. 1, comp. Polyc. 1. 2, Πάντας βάσταζε κ.τ.λ. (see Gal. vi. 2).

[1] Polycarp. Compare as Echoes:—Salutation, comp. Gal. vi. 16; c. 5. 3, comp. Gal. v. 7; c. 6. 3, comp. Gal. iv. 18.

Ibid. c. 5. 1. *Εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται.* (Gal. vi. 7.)

Ibid. c. 6. 3. *Ζηλωταὶ περὶ τὸ καλόν.* (Gal. iv. 18; comp. Titus ii. 14.)

Ibid. c. 9. 2. *Πεπεισμένους ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον, ἀλλ' ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ.* (Gal. ii. 2.)

Ibid. c. 12. 2. Qui crediturі sunt in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, et in ipsius patrem, "qui resuscitavit eum e mortuis." (Gal. i. 1.)

5. Justin Martyr.[1]

Dial. c. 95. *p.* 322 *C. Ἐπικατάρατος γὰρ εἴρηται πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά.* (Comp. Gal. iii. 10 as quoting Deut. xxvii. 26.)

Oratio ad Gentiles[2] *c.* 5. *Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς. . . . ὅτι καθάπερ ἐπαοιδὸς ἀγαθὸς ἐκ φωλεοῦ ἑξερπύσαι ποιήσας φυγαδεύει δεινὸν ἑρπετὸν, οὕτως ὁ λόγος ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μυχῶν τὰ δεινὰ τῆς αἰσθήσεως ἀπελαύνει πάθη· πρῶτον ἐπιθυμίαν, δι' ἧς πᾶν δεινὸν φύεται, ἔχθραι, ἔρεις, ζῆλος, ἐρίθειαι, θυμοὶ, τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις.* (Gal. iv. 12; v. 20, 21.)

6. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 4. 5. *Τὸ δὲ παρεδρέυοντες αὐτοὺς ἄστρας καὶ σελήνῃ τὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν μηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν ποιεῖσθαι.* (Gal. iv. 10.)

7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions and Muratorian Canon.

See before, Section I.

8. Tatian.[1]

Jerome, Comment. in Gal. III. c. 6. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 526.)

[1] Justin. Compare as Echoes in Justin's undoubted writings: Apol. I. 53. p. 88 C, Isaiah liv. 1 (quoted as in Gal. iv. 27), see also 2 Clem. 2. 1; Dial. cc. 89, 95, 96 (all referring to Deut. 21. 23 as in Gal. iii. 13); c. 119. τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν πίστιν (Gal. iii. 7).

[2] Of disputed genuineness.

[1] Tatian. See Otto's Tatian p. 166.

Tatianus, qui putativam Christi carnem introducens, omnem conjunctionem masculi ad foeminam immundam arbitratur, Encratitarum vel acerrimus haeresiarches, tali . . . usus est argumento: Si *qui seminat in carne, de carne serviturum* declaravit, deo quidem per consensum, in temperantiae autem et fornicationi et diabolo, dum consentire desinit.

9. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 16. *Ἐπὶ τὰ πτωχὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα καταπίπτομεν.* (Gal. iv. 9.)

10. Irenaeus.

B. III. 6. 5. Et apostolus autem Paulus, dicens: "Si enim his qui non erant Dii servistis, nunc cognoscentes Deum, immo cogniti a Deo." (Gal. iv. 8, 9.)

B. III. 7. 2. Sed et in ea quae est ad Galatas, sic ait: "Quid ergo lex factorum?" Posita est, usque quo veniat semen cui promissum est, disposita per angelos in manu mediatoris. (Gal. iii. 19.)

B. III. 16. 3. Et iterum in epistola, quae est ad Galatas, ait (sc. Paulus): "Cum autem venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus filium suum, factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret, ut adoptionem percipiamus." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.)

B. V. 21. 1. Et hoc est semen, de quo ait apostolus in epistola quae est ad Galatas: "Legem factorum positam, donec veniret semen cui promissum est." Manifestius autem adhuc in eadem ostendit epistola, sic dicens: "Cum autem venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus filium suum, factum de muliere." (Gal. iii. 19; iv. 4.)

11. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. III. 16. *p.* 556. *Διὸ καὶ Παῦλος Γαλάταις ἐπιστέλλων, φησί· Τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ μορφώθῃ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.* (Gal. iv. 19.)

12. Acts of Paul and Thecla.

C. 40. *Ἔλαβον τὸ λοῦτρον Παῦλε· ὁ γάρ σοι συνεργήσας εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κἀμοὶ συνήργησεν εἰς τὸ λούσασθαι.* (Gal. ii. 8.)

13. Tertullian.[1]

Adv. Marcion. V. 2. 1. Principalem adversus Judaïsmum epistolam nos quoque confitemur, quae Galatas docet.

De praescript. haeret. c. 6. Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, qui et alibi haereses inter carnalia crimina numerat, scribens ad Galatas.

14. Clementine Homilies.[1]

Hom. XIX. 22. *Αἰτιώμενος τὸν λαὸν ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίας υἱοὺς νεομηνιῶν τῶν κατὰ σελήνην καὶ σαββάτων ἀπεκάλει.* (Gal. iv. 10.)

[1] Tertullian. It is superfluous to quote at length Tertullian's numerous testimonies.

[1] Clem. Hom. Compare also Clem. Hom. XVII. 19. ἀνθέστηκάς μοι . . . κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις, which is an evident Echo of Gal. ii. 11.

XVII.

EPHESIANS.[1]

(*COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.*)

1. Barnabas.

C. 6. 15. *Ναὸς γὰρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ Κυρίῳ τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς καρδίας.* (Eph. ii. 22.)

[1] The testimony of the early Church is unanimous in favour of the Pauline origin of the Epistle. The only doubt has been as to its destination. Tertullian charged Marcion and other heretics with the ascription of a false title to it—as though addressed to the Laodiceans. Basil stated that in ancient copies it was not ascribed to the Ephesians, but to the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπών· Τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν (Basil. contra Eunomium). Of this statement confirmation is found in the total absence of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ from the beginning of the Epistle in the Sinaitic MS (ℵ) and their insertion by a later hand in the Vatican (B). In the quotation from Origen in Cramer's Catena, the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are perhaps omitted, though Origen elsewhere ascribes the Epistle to Paul. (See extracts under 'Origen.')

Schleiermacher and De Wette, on internal grounds, objected to this Epistle. Baur, Hilgenfeld and others have included Colossians in the same condemnation. Baur regards Ephesians as secondary to Colossians, but supposes them to have been contemporaneous and connected. The ground on which he thus makes them fall together, (just as Paley, Hor. Paul., c. VI. made them stand together) is the nature of their resemblance to each other, which is not mere resemblance but repetition. He finds also a mutual dependence; as in Eph. iv. 21 compared with Coloss. iv. 16. He endeavours to prove that they are not Pauline because of the continued discourse upon the spirit-world, which is characteristic of Gnosticism, but unlike St Paul: the use of Gnostic terms and implied reference to Gnostic doctrines: the acquaintance with Montanism: the state of the development of the Church, &c. The special objections of Baur and his followers to Ephesians are based on its want of salutations and personal allusions (but see 2 Cor., Gal. and 1 & 2 Thess.); and passages in the Epistle which seem to intimate that Paul himself had not been their teacher (*e.g.* i. 15; iii. 2, 3; iv. 21). The special objections to Colossians are found in its development of Soteriology into Christology, and that Christology an echo of Gnosticism. [On the resemblance between the Epistles see Hilg., Einl. p. 671: on the points of essential difference see Reuss, Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T. § 118. See also Gloag's Introd. to Pauline Epistles, p. 328.]

After all has been said that can be said against the Epistles, their Pauline origin is not disproved. The objections assume (1) that the seeds and intimations of Gnosticism in St Paul's day were not sufficiently obvious to a mind like his to admit of his exposing them; and (2) that the Gnostics of the second century did not adopt the Apostle's expressions, and endeavour to weave them into their

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.

C 46. 5. *Ἵνα τί ἔρεις, καὶ θυμοὶ, καὶ διχοστασίαι, καὶ σχίσματα, πόλεμός τε ἐν ὑμῖν; ἢ οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν, καὶ ἕνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ; Ἵνα τί διέλκομεν καὶ διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ στασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον, καὶ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀπόνοιαν ἐρχόμεθα ὥστε ἐπιλαθέσθαι ἡμᾶς ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων;* (Eph. iv. 4; comp. 1 Cor. xii.)

Second Epistle.

C. 14. 2. *Οὐκ οἴομαι δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι ἐκκλησία ζῶσα σῶμά ἐστι Χριστοῦ (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· τὸ ἄρσεν ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, τὸ θῆλυ ἡ ἐκκλησία) κ.τ.λ.* (Eph. i. 23; iv. 12.)[1]

C. 19. 2. *Ἕνια γὰρ πονηρὰ πράσσοντες οὐ γινώσκομεν διὰ τὴν διψυχίαν καὶ ἀπιστίαν τὴν ἐνοῦσαν ἐν τοῖς στήθεσιν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσμεθα τὴν διάνοιαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνθυμιῶν τῶν ματαίων.* See also 1 Clem. 36. 2. (Eph. iv. 7.)

3. Hermas.

Mand. X. 2. 5. *Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ τὴν λύπην· καὶ μὴ θλῖβε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν, μήποτε ἐντεύξηται κατὰ σοῦ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἀποστῇ ἀπὸ σοῦ.* (Eph. iv. 30.)

systems. Those assumptions are unwarrantable. In regard to the first point, it can be proved that, from the very necessity of the case, Gnosticism arose the moment that Christianity came into contact with heathen philosophy, especially with the combinations of Judaism and heathen philosophy which were prevalent in such places as Alexandria and Antioch in the first Christian century. In regard to the second, it is easy to see how Valentinus adopted such words as πλήρωμα, σοφία &c., and constructed his system; but impossible to understand how such epistles as those two could be written in the second century when the air was full of the speculations of Valentinus and others like him. Though Baur asserts that Valentinus' system was "too original" to be explained by what Tertullian said of it, the conclusion of most men is that Tertullian was right: *Valentinus . . . materiam ad scripturas excogitavit.*

Since Ussher it has been often supposed that the Ephesian Epistle was originally a circular letter, of which the copy to the Ephesians remains, although it was the letter sent to Laodicea that the Colossians were to get. This theory accounts for the statement of Basil, the practice of Marcion, and the evidence of ℵ and B.

[1] 2 Clement. Some of the sentences which follow in the chapter seem to be written in view of the Valentinian speculations.

Sim. IX. 13. 5. *Οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες τῷ Κυρίῳ . . . ἔσονται εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα, εἰς ἓν σῶμα, καὶ μία χρόα τῶν ἱματισμῶν αὐτῶν.* See also IX. 13. 7. and compare IX. 17. 4. (Eph. iv. 4.)

4. Ignatius.

Ephes. c. 12. 3. *Πάροδός ἐστε τῶν εἰς Θεὸν ἀναιρουμένων, Παύλου συμμύσται, τοῦ ἡγιασμένου, τοῦ μεμαρτυρημένου, ἀξιομακαρίστου, οὗ γένοιτό μοι ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη εὑρεθῆναι, ὅταν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω, ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ*[1] *μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.*

Magnes. c. 7. 1. *Μία προσευχὴ, μία δέησις, εἷς νοῦς, μία ἐλπὶς, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῇ χαρᾷ τῇ ἀμώμῳ, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, οὗ ἄμεινον οὐδέν ἐστιν.* (Eph. iv. 3-6.)

Philad. c. 2. 1. *Τέκνα οὖν φωτὸς ἀληθείας, φεύγετε τὸν μερισμὸν καὶ τὰς διδασκαλίας.* (Eph. v. 8; comp. John xii. 26; 1 Thess. v. 5.)

Ad Polyc. c. 5. 1. *Ὁμοίως καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου παράγγελλε ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπᾶν τὰς συμβίους ὡς ὁ Κύριος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.* (Eph. v. 25, 29.)[2]

5. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 1. 3. *Εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* (Eph. ii. 8, 9.)

Ibid. c. 12. 1. Confido[1] enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis, et nihil vos latet: mihi autem non est concessum.

[1] Ignatius. Ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, usually translated "in the whole Epistle." Comp. πᾶσα οἰκοδομή Eph. ii. 21. Others translate: "in all his Epistles."

[2] Echoes:—Ad Eph. 1. μεγέθει . . . πληρώματι (Eph. i. 19, iv. 13). Ibid. 4. 2. μέλη (Eph. v. 30); Ibid. 9. 1. λίθοι ναοῦ (Eph. ii. 22); Ad Polyc. 6. 2. ὅπλα (Eph. vi. 11).

[1] Polycarp. This is only found in the Latin. As it stands it is a conjunction of a Psalm and of the Epistle as being parts of "these scriptures" (of which he has been speaking). Doubt has been thrown upon the genuineness of this, on the ground that the Latin version has inserted "*et quod dictum est*" in c. 2. between two passages of the New Testament, while the Greek has only καί. But in c. 2. the first quotation is introduced with εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων, which is translated in the Latin "*quod dominus docens dixit.*" To insert "*et quod dictum est*" before the second quotation in that case as a translation of καί is therefore to make no real change on the original; while to introduce "*ut his scripturis dictum est*" in the case of c. 12 would have been a serious change. Dr Davidson (Int. to N. T. I. 382. 2nd Ed.) incorrectly states that in c. 2 "The translator has introduced a word of Jesus's with 'as it is written.'

Modo, ut his scripturis dictum est, "*Irascimini, et nolite peccare,*" et "Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram." (Ps. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 26.)

6. Muratorian Canon, Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

See before, Section I.

7. Irenaeus.

B. V. 2. 3. *Καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ.* (Eph. v. 30.)

B. V. 14. 3. Quemadmodum Apostolus Ephesiis ait: "In quo habuimus redemptionem per sanguinem ejus, remissionem peccatorum." Et rursus eisdem: "Vos, inquit, qui aliquando cratis longe, facti estis juxta, in sanguine Christi." Et iterum: "Inimicitias in carne sua, legem praeceptorum decretis evacuans." (Eph. i. 7; ii. 11-15.)

8. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. I. 7. *p.* 74. *Διὰ τὴν τύφλωσιν τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας σου.* See also II. 35. p. 111. (Eph. iv. 18.)

Ibid. II. 16. *p.* 95. *Τῇ δὲ πέμπτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐγενήθη ζῶα· δι' ὧν καὶ ἐν τούτοις δείκνυται ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ.* See also I. 6. p. 73. (Eph. iii. 10.)

Ibid. II. 28. *p.* 104. *Ἕως καὶ τοῦ δεῦρο ἐνεργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐνθουσιαζομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώποις.* (Eph. ii. 2.)

9. Clement of Alexandria.

Paedag. I. 5. *p.* 108. *Σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ζητούμενον, ὧδέ πως λέγων· "Μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι κ.τ.λ."* (Eph. iv. 13, 14.)

Strom. IV. 8. *p.* 592. *Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει· ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.* (Eph. v. 21.)

10. Tertullian.[1]

Adv. Marcion. V. 11. Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos *ad Ephesios* praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero *ad Laodicenos.*

Ibid. V. 17. Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam *ad Ephesios* habemus emissam, non *ad Laodicenos,* sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes Apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam.

11. Clementine Homilies.

Hom. XIX. 2. *Καὶ πάλιν· μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ.* (Eph. iv. 27.)

12. Origen.

Περὶ ἀρχῶν III. C. V. § 4. *p.* 149. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 328.) Sed et Apostolus in epistola *ad Ephesios* eodem sermone usus est cum ait: "Qui elegit nos ante mundi constitutionem." (Eph. i. 4.)

Cramer's Catena, VI. 102. *Ὠριγένης δέ φησι, ἐπὶ μόνων Ἐφεσίων εὕρομεν κείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι" καὶ ζητοῦμεν εἰ μὴ παρέλκει προσκείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι" τί δύναται σημαίνειν.*[1] (Eph. i. 1.)

13. Epiphanius.

Haeres. 42. *c.* 9. *p.* 310. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 708.) *Ἔχει δὲ* (sc. *Μαρκίων*) *καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικέας λεγομένης μέρη.*

Ibid. Schol. p. 374. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 811.) *Εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, εἷς Χριστὸς, εἷς Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ πάντων ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.* (Eph. iv. 5, 6.)

[1] Tertullian. These extracts show that in Tertullian's opinion the Epistle was addressed to the Ephesians; and that it was also in Marcion's Canon, but under another name. Valentinus also referred to it as Scripture.

[1] Origen here seems to omit the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, but in view of the previous quotation nothing can be founded upon the omission. See before, Ephesians: note 1. See also Cont. Cels. III. 20.

Refut. Συναδόντως μὲν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ὦ Μαρκίων, καὶ ταύτας τὰς κατὰ σοῦ μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης πρὸς Λαοδικέας συνήγαγες κατὰ σοῦ μαρτυρίας.[1]

14. Jerome.

In Epist. ad Ephes. praefat. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 540.) Scribebat (sc. Paulus) ad Ephesios. . . . Hoc ipsum scriptura refert quomodo Paulus ad Ephesios sermocinetur.

Ad Ephes. I. c. 1. (Ibid. p. 545.) Quidam curiosius, quam necesse, putant ex eo, quod Mosi dictum sit: *Haec dices filiis Israel, qui est, misit me,* etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos; ut quomodo a sancto sancti, a justo justi, a sapiente sapientes: ita ab eo qui est, hi "qui sunt" appellentur. . . . Alii vero simpliciter, non ad "eos qui sunt," sed "qui Ephesi" sancti et fideles "sunt," scriptum arbitrantur.

[1] Epiphanius. The passage immediately preceding contains a list of the books of Marcion's Canon: Galatians, Corinthians (1 and 2), Romans, Thessalonians (1 and 2), Ephesians, Philemon, Philippians. Then come the words: *He has also some portions of the Epistle called "To the Laodiceans."* Epiphanius appears to have become confused as to Marcion's 'Laodiceans,' which he supposed to be different from the Epistle to the Ephesians. The second quotation in our text shows that Marcion was really quoting from 'Ephesians' when Epiphanius supposed him to draw from some distinct source called Laodiceans. And accordingly he apostrophizes Marcion in order to tell him that those Laodicean words are also in the canonical Ephesians!

XVIII.

PHILIPPIANS.

(*COMPARE SECTIONS I-III, XI, XII.*)

1. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.

C. 16. 1. *Ταπεινοφρονούντων γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, οὐκ ἐπαιρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ. Τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζονείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίπερ δυνάμενος· ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν, καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησεν. Φησὶ γάρ· Κύριε τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ.* (Isa. liii. 1, &c.) *Ὁρᾶτε, ἄνδρες ἀγαπητοὶ, τίς ὁ ὑπογραμμὸς ὁ δεδομένος ἡμῖν· εἰ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν, τί ποιήσομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες;* (Phil. ii. 5, &c.)[1]

Second Epistle.

C. 18. 2. *Σπουδάζω τὴν δικαιοσύνην διώκειν, ὅπως ἰσχύσω κἂν ἐγγὺς αὐτῆς γενέσθαι, φοβούμενος τὴν κρίσιν τὴν μέλλουσαν.* (Phil. iii. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 11.)

2. Ignatius.

Philad. c. 8. 2.[1] *Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χριστομαθίαν.* (Phil. ii. 3.)[2]

Smyrn. c. 11. 3. *Τέλειοι ὄντες, τέλεια καὶ φρονεῖτε.* (Phil. iii. 15.)

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: C. 2. 5. εἰλικρινεῖς (Phil. i. 10); c. 5. 5. βραβεῖον (Phil. iii. 14); c. 7. 1. ἀγών (Phil. i. 30); c. 19. 1. 2. pressing on to the mark (σκοπόν) (Phil. iii. 14); c. 21. 1. ἀξίως αὐτοῦ πολιτευόμενοι (Phil. i. 27); (Compare also Polyc. 5. 2.)

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echoes: Rom. 2. 2. σπονδισθῆναι (Phil. ii. 17). Ibid. 6. καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν, κ.τ.λ. (Phil. i. 21).

[2] Compare c. 1. 1. κατὰ κενοδοξίαν.

3. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. c. 2. 1, Ὧι ὑπετάγη τὰ πάντα ἐπουράνια καὶ ἐπίγεια· ᾧ πᾶσα πνοὴ λατρεύει. (Phil. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 28.)

Ibid. c. 3. 1. Ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης· ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς προεπελακτίσασθέ με. Οὔτε γὰρ ἐγώ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς γενόμενος ἐν ὑμῖν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων ἐδίδαξεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ βεβαίως τὸν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον· ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς,[2] εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε,[3] δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν.

Ibid. c. 9. 2. Πεπεισμένους, ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ ὅτι εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον αὐτοῖς τόπον εἰσὶ παρὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ, ᾧ καὶ συνέπαθον. (Phil. ii. 16, 17.)

Ibid. c. 11. 3. Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis, vel audivi, in quibus laborávit beatus Paulus; qui estis laudati in principio epistolae ejus. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis, quae Deum solae tunc cognoverant: nos autem nondum noveramus. (Thess. i. 4; Phil. i. 5.)

4. Martyrdom of Polycarp.

C. 1. 2. Περιέμενε γὰρ [ὁ Πολύκαρπος], ἵνα παραδοθῇ, ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα μιμηταὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ γενώμεθα, μὴ μόνον σκοποῦντες τὸ καθ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ τοὺς πέλας. (Phil. ii. 4.)

5. Justin Martyr.

De Resurrect. c. 7. Ἐξῆς δὲ λεκτέον πρὸς τοὺς ἀτιμάζοντας

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echoes: C. 1. 1. συνεχάρην μεγάλως (Phil. iv. 10); c. 10. 1. diligentes invicem &c. (Phil. ii. 2-5); c. 12. 3. inimicis crucis (Phil. iii. 18); c. 5. 2. (Phil. i. 27).

[2] Is this a reference to more than one Epistle? In the fourth extract the Latin gives a singular form *Epistola*. Either the singular or the plural may denote a single Epistle. See this abundantly proved by Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 138.

[3] Compare παρακύπτω εἰς (John xx. 11; James i. 25; 1 Pet. i. 12).

τὴν σάρκα καὶ φάσκοντας μὴ ἀξίαν εἶναι τῆς ἀναστάσεως μηδὲ τῆς οὐρανίου πολιτείας. (Phil. iii. 20.)

C. 9. *Καθὼς εἴρηκεν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν κατοίκησιν ὑπάρχειν.* (Phil. iii. 20 and, more clearly, John xiv. 2, 3.)[1]

6. Letter to Diognetus.[1]

C. 5. 9. *Ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται.* (Phil. iii. 20.)

7. Letter of Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 3. *Οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ ἐγένοντο, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐκ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.* (Phil. ii. 6.)

8. Irenaeus.

B. IV. 8. 4. Quoniam igitur cum simplicitate ecclesia offert, juste munus ejus purum sacrificium apud Deum deputatum est. Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: "Repletus sum acceptis ab Epaphrodito, quae a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo." (Phil. iv. 18.)

B. V. 13. 3. De qua resurrectione apostolus in ea quae est ad Philippenses, ait: "Conformatus morti ejus, si quo modo occurram ad resurrectionem quae est a mortuis." (Phil. iii. 10, 11.)

Ibid. Et rursus ad Philippenses ait: "Nostra autem conversatio in coelis est; unde et Salvatorem exspectamus Dominum Jesum, qui transfigurabit corpus humilitatis nostrae conforme corpori gloriae suae, ita ut possit secundum operationem virtutis suae." (Phil. iii. 20, &c.)

9. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. II. 17. *Τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦσιν.* (Phil. iii. 19.)

[1] Justin has some echoes: Dial. c. 3. p. 229 C (Phil. iii. 3)(?); Dial. c. 33. p. 251 B, ταπεινός, κ.τ.λ. (Phil. ii. 8. 9); and (perhaps the most certain) Dial. c. 134. p. 364 C, τὴν μέχρι σταυροῦ δουλείαν (Phil. ii. 7. 8).

[1] Diognetus. Compare as echo: C. 2. 1 with Phil. ii. 10.

Ibid. 2. 36. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ταῦτα ἀληθῆ καὶ ὠφέλιμα καὶ δίκαια καὶ προσφιλῆ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις τυγχάνει, δῆλόν ἐστι. (Phil. iv. 8.)

Jerome, Ad Algas. quaest. 6. (Vallars. Vol. I. p. 860.) Theophilus Antiochenae ecclesiae septimus post Petrum apostolum episcopus, qui quatuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens, ingenii sui nobis monumenta dimisit, haec super hac parabola in suis commentariis est locutus. . . . Dixitque (Paulus) in corde suo: Quid faciam? . . . Coepitque eos qui prius versabantur in lege, et sic in Christum crediderunt, ne arbitrarentur se in lege justificandos, docere legem abolitam, prophetas praeteriisse, et quae antea pro lucro fuerant, reputari in stercora. (Phil. iii. 8.)

10. Clement of Alexandria.

Paedag. I. 6. 52. *p.* 129. Αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι· διώκω δὲ εἰ καὶ καταλάβω, κ.τ.λ. (Phil. iii. 12, &c.)

Strom. IV. 13. 92. *p.* 604. Εἰ δὲ σπένδεται ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ τῇ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως χαίρων καὶ συγχαίρων, πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ, τοὺς Φιλιππησίους συμμετύχους τῆς χάριτος καλῶν, πῶς αὐτοὺς συμψύχους λέγει. (Phil. ii.)

11. Tertullian.

De resurrect. carn. c. 23. Ad quam (sc. spem resurrectionis) pendens et ipse quum Philippensibus scribit: "si qua," inquit, "concurram in resurrectionem, quae est a mortuis. Non quia jam accepi aut consummatus sum." (Phil. iii. 11, 12.)

Ibid. c. 47. Quod elisum est suscitans, et quidem de terra in coelum, ubi nostrum municipatum Philippenses quoque ab Apostolo discunt: "Unde et salutificatorem nostrum exspectamus Jesum Christum, qui transfigurabit corpus nostrae humilitatis, conformale corpori gloriae suae." Sine dubio post resurrectionem, quia nec ipse Christus glorificatus est ante passionem. (Phil. iii. 21.)

XIX.

COLOSSIANS.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III, XI, XII.)

[1] The Epistle to the Colossians contains many of the same words and phrases as that to the Ephesians. And yet the purpose of this is quite distinct from that of the other—being definitely and polemically directed against certain false teachers who were misleading the Colossian church; whereas the other Epistle deals with doctrines more generally and comprehensively. Moreover, the real subject of the Epistle is not the same in each case; the argument of Eph. i. and ii. is not in the Colossian Epistle at all. In other cases the same words are used, but with a different reference (comp. Eph. iv. 16 with Col. ii. 19). It is in expressions rather than in purpose that the points of resemblance and the instances of repetition are found (see Reuss: Les Epitres Pauliniennes, II. 149). The genuineness of Colossians was not disputed until this century, and the objections rest on subjective grounds. First of all (as is stated in the notes on Ephesians), the close correspondence between this Epistle and that to Ephesus is said to awaken suspicion that one at least is a forgery. While some for this cause put away Ephesians, others discard both. Then further, the words in the Epistles which are familiar in Gnostic writings, and not only familiar but keynotes of such systems as that of Valentinus, are regarded as proof that they originated while those systems were in vogue *i.e.*, in the second century (see notes on Ephesians). The polemical references in Colossians are next compared with the doctrines of Ebionitism: and the conclusion is that in regard to circumcision (ii. 11), peculiarities of diet (ii. 21), and angel-worship (ii. 21), the writer was denouncing Ebionites. In order to take the ground away from the whole system, he proclaims the doctrine of the Person of Christ against the well-known Ebionite theories that Jesus was a creature, created not begotten of God, as a chief angel might be. All this might be admitted in so far as regards Ebionitism: but it does not give a date in the second century, for the principles of Ebionitism must have been at work from the time when Jews adopted Christianity without fully accepting the Gospel doctrine of Christ's Personal Deity. Baur's argument for a date in the second century really rests upon the occurrence of its words and phrases in Gnostic systems. Besides what was said in the notes to Ephesians as to the greater probability of a Gnostic quoting and twisting Pauline words, than of a forger in Paul's name adopting the terminology of a Gnostic with whom he did not wish to be supposed to agree, we may here draw attention to the actual use of the words in question by Valentinus (whom Baur cites) and by the author of Colossians respectively. In the Valentinian system πλήρωμα, σοφία, πίστις, σταυρός, and so on, are used with technical meanings which are not applicable in any one case in the Epistles, unless perhaps that the varied fortunes of σοφία in the Valentinian fable may be supposed to correspond to the Pauline πολυποίκιλος σοφία of Ephesians iii. 10, or that the legend of the πλήρωμα of Valentinian aeons contributing to make up the Saviour may be imagined to resemble Col. i. 19; ii. 9. But even when the resemblance is admitted, the grotesque story of the Gnostic (however metaphorically interpreted) is so evidently a perversion of the Scripture teaching, that to imagine it the original and the Colossian words the imitation is to go beyond all probability.

On the relative priority of the two closely related Epistles critical opinion widely varies. If that to Colossians was actually first written, the reference (Col. iv. 16) to the Epistle from Laodicea (which was probably that we know as

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 12. 7. *Ἔχεις πάλιν καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν.* (Col. i. 16.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

3. Ignatius.[1]

4. Polycarp.[1]

5. Justin Martyr.[1]

Dial. c. 84. *p.* 310 *B.* *Ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς σημεῖον καὶ πιστὸν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔμελλε γίνεσθαι, τουτέστι διὰ παρθενικῆς μήτρας τὸν πρωτότοκον τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων σαρκοποιηθέντα ἀληθῶς παιδίον γενέσθαι.* (Col. i. 15.)

Ibid. c. 85. *p.* 311 *B.* *Κατὰ γὰρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως, καὶ διὰ παρθένου γεννηθέντος . . . πᾶν δαιμόνιον ἐξορκιζόμενον νικᾶται καὶ ὑποτάσσεται.* (Col. i. 15.)

Ibid. c. 100. *p.* 326 *D.* *Γνόντες αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ*

'Ephesians') is not so easily explained, as it is if Paul knew that when he wrote to Colossians the letter which, when they got theirs, was, or soon would be, in Laodicea, and so within their reach, was already written. But the point is too easily debated on either side to be of great clearness.

[1] Barnabas. Compare as Echoes: C. 14. 5. λυτρωσάμενος ἐκ τοῦ σκότους (Col. i. 13); c. 10. 9. κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 23); and perhaps c. 21. 1 (comp. Col. ii. 6.)

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: C. 21. 1. (Col. i. 10); c. 27. 4. (Col. i. 17); c. 50. 1. (Col. iii. 14). All of these echoes are faint and doubtful.

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echoes: Eph. 2. 1. συνδούλου (Col. i. 7); c. 10. 2. ἑδραῖοι τῇ πίστει (Col. i. 23); c. 18. 2. κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ (Col. i. 25). Magnes. 9. 1. μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, κ.τ.λ. (Col. ii. 16, 17).

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echoes: C. 1. 2. (Col. ii. 7); c. 11. 2. (Col. iii. 5); c. 12. 3. (Col. i. 28).

[1] Justin. The following passages seem to intimate with sufficient clearness that Justin was acquainted with Paul's writings. It is not a competent argument on the other side to say that "there is a presumption against Justin's caring to know any of the Apostle's writings." Yet this is all that Dr Davidson (who admits that "Paul's letter to the Colossians . . . existed long before") can advance (Int. to N. T. I. 175).

Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων. Comp. Dial. c. 125. p. 354 C. (Col. i. 15.)

Ibid. c. 138. *p.* 367 *D.* *Ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὤν.* (Col. i. 15.)

6. Tatian.

Orat. ad Graecos, c. 5. *p.* 145 *A.* *Ὁ δὲ λόγος, οὐ κατὰ κενοῦ χωρήσας, ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πατρὸς γίνεται.* (Col. i. 15.)

7. Muratorian Canon, Syriac and Old Latin Versions.[1]

(See before, pp. 1. 2.)

7. Irenaeus.

B. II. 22. 4. Sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed et secundum aetatem, sanctificans simul et seniores, exemplum ipsis quoque fiens; deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit *primogenitus ex mortuis ipse primatum tenens in omnibus,* princeps vitae, prior omnium et praecedens omnes. (Col. i. 18.)

B. III. 14. 1. Et iterum in ea epistola quae est ad Colossenses, ait: "Salutat vos Lucas medicus dilectus." (Col. iv. 14.)

B. V. 14. 2. Et propter hoc apostolus in ea epistola quae est ad Colossenses, ait: "Et vos cum essetis aliquando alienati, et inimici cogitationi ejus[1] in operibus malis, nunc autem reconciliati in corpore carnis ejus, per mortem ejus, exhibere vos sanctos et castos et sine crimine in conspectu ejus." (Col. i. 21, 22.)

8. Theophilus.[1]

Ad Autolyc. II. c. 22. *p.* 100 *B.* *Πρὸ γάρ τι γίνεσθαι τοῦτον εἶχε σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα. Ὁπότε δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἐβουλεύσατο, τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέν-*

[1] Colossians was in Marcion's Canon.

[1] Irenaeus. Another reading is *inimici cogitationis ejus.*

[1] Theophilus. Comp. as shorter quotation or echo: Theoph. 2. 17, p. 96. τὰ ἄνω φρονοῦντες (Col. iii. 2).

νησε προφορικὸν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, οὐ κενωθεὶς αὐτὸς τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ λόγον γεννήσας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ διὰ παντὸς ὁμιλῶν. (Col. i. 15-17.)

9. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. I. 15. *p.* 325. *Κἀν τῇ πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς ἐπιστολῇ "νουθετοῦντες" γράφει "πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ."* (Col. i. 28.)

Ibid. VI. 8. *p.* 771. *Ὡσαύτως ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ἐπιστρέφουσι Κολοσσαεῦσι· "βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας," κ.τ.λ.* (Col. ii. 8.)

10. Tertullian.[1]

De praescript. haeret. c. 7. A quibus nos apostolus refrenans nominatim philosophiam contestatur caveri oportere, scribens ad Colossenses: "Videte, ne qui sit circumveniens vos per philosophiam et inanem seductionem, secundum traditionem hominum praeter providentiam Spiritus Sancti." (Col. ii. 8.)

De resurrect. carnis c. 23. Docet quidem Apostolus, Colossensibus scribens, mortuos fuisse nos aliquando alienatos et inimicos sensus Domini, quum in operibus pessimis agebamus, dehinc consepultos Christo in baptismate, et conresuscitatos in eo per fidem efficaciae Dei, qui illum suscitarit e mortuis. "Et vos cum mortui essetis in delictis et praeputatione carnis vestrae, vivificavit cum eo, donatis vobis omnibus delictis." (Col. ii. 13.)

[1] The quotations of Tertullian are very numerous.

XX.

FIRST THESSALONIANS.[1]

(*COMPARE SECTIONS I-III, XI, XII.*)

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

Ep. I. 38. 1. *Σωζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.* (1 Thess. v. 23.)

Ibid. c. 38. 4. *Ὀφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ.* (1 Thess. v. 18.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

Eph. 10. 1. *Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε.* (1 Thess. v. 17.)

Philad. 2. 1. *Τέκνα οὖν φωτὸς ἀληθείας, φεύγετε τὸν μερισμὸν καὶ τὰς κακοδιδασκαλίας.* (1 Thess. v. 5.)

Ad Polyc. 1. 3. *Προσευχαῖς σχόλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις.* (1 Thess. v. 17.)

4. Polycarp.[1]

5. Syriac, Old Latin, and Muratorian Canon.

See before.[1]

[1] Baur was the first to doubt the authenticity of this Epistle. He argues that its language and its apocalyptic ideas are not Pauline. His views have not been widely adopted. Hilgenfeld refutes his arguments, as also does Davidson. See an excellent statement of the case regarding the two Epistles to Thessalonica in Reuss, Gesch. § 78-82. See Paley's *Horae Paulinae* for some suggestive remarks.

[1] Barnabas has the following echoes: C. 4. 13, warning against sloth and sleep (1 Thess. v. 6, &c.); c. 21. 6, Θεοδίδακτοι (1 Thess. iv. 9).

[1] Clement of Rome. Compare as echoes: 1 Clem. c. 35. 5, πίστις πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (comp. 1 Thess. i. 8), and c. 44. 6, ἀμέμπτως τετιμημένης λειτουργίας (comp. 1 Thess. v. 23).

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echo: Ad Polyc. 6. 2 (comp. 1 Thess. v. 8).

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echoes: Phil. 2. 2 (comp. 1 Thess. v. 22); c. 4. 3 (comp. 1 Thess. v. 17).

[1] It was also in Marcion's Canon.

6. Irenaeus.

B. V. 6. 1. Et propter hoc apostolus seipsum exponens, explanavit perfectum et spiritualem salutis hominem, in prima epistola ad Thessalonicenses dicens sic: "Deus autem pacis sanctificet vos perfectos, et integer vester spiritus, et anima, et corpus sine querela in adventum Domini Jesu Christi servetur." (1 Thess. v. 23.)

L. V. 30. 2. Hoc et apostolus ait: "Cum dixerint, pax, et munitio, tunc subitaneus illis superveniet interitus." (1 Thess. v. 3.)

7. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Paedag. 5. 19. p. 109. *Τοῦτό τοι σαφέστατα ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ὑπεσημήνατο, εἰπών· Δυνάμενοι ἐν βαρει εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα.* (1 Thess. ii. 7.)

Strom. I. 9. 53. p. 347. *Πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, ὁ ἀπόστολός φησι, καὶ τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.* (1 Thess. v. 21.)

8. Tertullian.[1]

De resurrect. carn. c. 24. Quae haec tempora, cum Thessalonicensibus disce. Legimus enim: "Qualiter conversi sitis ab idolis ad serviendum vivo et vero Deo, et ad exspectandum e coelis filium ejus, quem suscitavit ex mortuis, Jesum." (1 Thess. i. 9, 10.)

Ibid. Et ideo majestas Spiritus Sancti perspicax ejusmodi sensuum, et in ipsa ad Thessalonicenses epistola suggerit: "De temporibus autem et temporum spatiis, fratres, non est necessitas scribendi vobis. Ipsi enim certissime scitis, quod dies Domini, quasi fur nocte, ita adveniet etc." (1 Thess. v. 1, &c.)

[1] Clement of Alexandria. About ten other passages could be cited from Clement to the same effect. He calls it ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, Strom. IV. 87. p. 602, &c.

[1] Tertullian has more than thirty citations from this Epistle.

XXI.

SECOND THESSALONIANS.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III, XI, XII.)

1. Barnabas.

C. 15. 5. *Ὅταν ἐλθὼν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καταργήσει τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς.* (2 Thess. ii. 3.)

2. Polycarp.

Philipp. 11. 3. Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis, vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistolae ejus. "De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis," quae Deum tunc solae cognoverant. (2 Thess. i. 4.)[1]

C. 11 4. Sobrii ergo estote et vos in hoc; "et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis," sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate, ut omnium vestrum corpus salvetis. (2 Thess. iii. 15.)

3. Justin Martyr.

Dial. c. 110. *p.* 336 *D. Ὅταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕψιστον ἔξαλλα λαλῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνομα τολμήσῃ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, κ.τ.λ.* (2 Thess. ii. 3.)

4. Irenaeus.

B. III. 7. 2. Et iterum in secunda ad Thessalonicenses, de antichristo dicens: "Et tunc revelabitur iniquus, quem Dominus Jesus Christus interficiet spiritu oris sui, et destruet praesentia adventus sui illum, cujus est adventus secundum operationem

[1] The second Epistle to the Thessalonians has been of late assailed. The arguments mainly rest on c. ii. 1-12, the doctrine of the man of sin. See Baur's Paulus, or most recently Hilg. Einl. p. 642. Hilgenfeld ascribes it to the reign of Trajan. See an able reply in Davidson's Int. to N. T. Vol. I. p. 8, &c.

[1] Polycarp. See under Epistle to Philippians, and note.

Satanae, in omni virtute et signis, et portentis mendacii." (2 Thess. ii. 8.)

B. V. 25. 1. De quo apostolus in epistola, quae est ad Thessalonicenses secunda, sic ait: "Quoniam nisi venerit abscessio primum, et revelatus fuerit homo peccati, filius perditionis, qui adversatur et extollit se super omne quod dicitur Deus, aut colitur: ita ut in templo Dei sedeat, ostendens semetipsum tanquam sit Deus." (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.)

5. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. V. 3. p. 655. *"Οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι" φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος "ἡ γνῶσις· προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις."* (2 Thess. iii. 2.)

6. Tertullian.

De resurrect. carn. c. 24. Et in secunda (sc. epistola ad Thess.) pleniore sollicitudine ad eosdem: "Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et congregationem nostram ad illum, ne cito commoveamini animo, neque turbemini, neque per spiritum, neque per sermonem, scilicet pseudoprophetarum, neque per epistolam, scilicet pseudapostolorum, ac si per nostram, quasi insistat dies Domini." (2 Thess. ii. 2, 3.)

Scorpiac., c. 13. Paulus vero apostolus de persecutore, qui primus ecclesiae sanguinem fudit, postea gladium stilo mutans, et convertens machaeram in aratrum, lupus rapax Benjamin, dehinc ipse adferens escam secundum Jacob, qualiter martyria, jam et sibi optabilia, commendat, cum de Thessalonicensibus gaudens, "Uti," inquit, "gloriemur in vobis in ecclesiis Dei pro tolerantia vestra et fide, in omnibus persecutionibus et pressuris, quibus sustinetis ostentamen justi judicii Dei, ut digni habeamini regno ejus, pro quo et patimini." (2 Thess. i. 4.)

XXII.

FIRST TIMOTHY.[1]

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 6. 7. *Ἐν σαρκὶ οὖν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος φανεροῦσθαι καὶ πάσχειν.* Also c. 6. 14. and other passages. (Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 7. 3. *Καὶ ἴδωμεν τί καλὸν, καὶ τί τερπνὸν καὶ προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς.* (1 Tim. v. 4.)

[1] 1 Timothy. The "Pastoral Epistles" are so named because they contain instructions to young Pastors; although the title does not strictly apply to 2 Timothy. The external testimony to them all is sufficient. Clement of Rome may be said to quote Titus, Polycarp quotes 1 Timothy; Athenagoras and Theophilus do so also. Without dwelling on the coincidence in expression between Justin Martyr and 1 Timothy, we may consider that (even before Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, whose testimony is beyond dispute) the early date of the Pastoral Epistles as a whole (and they stand or fall together) is established. It is to be observed on the other hand that Marcion, Basilides, and other heretics rejected them all (see Tert. adv. Marc. V. 21, and Jerome), and that Tatian rejected those to Timothy but accepted Titus (perhaps because it regards the heretics as more specially Jewish). From Tatian's time till this century the Pastoral Epistles were accepted by all. Schmidt (Int. to N. T. p. 260) suggested doubts because of discrepancies with Acts. But Schleiermacher, here as elsewhere, was the leader of many. In his letter to Gass (1807) he denounced 1 Timothy as an imitation of 2 Timothy and Titus, and founded special objections on its peculiarity of language, historical difficulties, and the plan of the Epistle, which he regarded as unworthy of the great Apostle. Baur of course rejected them all. See his "Die sogenannten Pastoral-Briefe," 1835, and "Paulus der Apostel," 1867. Reuss (Les Epitres Pauliniennes, 1878) rejects 1 Timothy and Titus, but admits 2 Timothy as written during the first imprisonment. Meyer, like De Wette, wavered at different times, but in 1854 (and 1872) believed that they depended on the more than doubtful basis of a second imprisonment. Huther and Wiesinger ably defend the authenticity of the letters. In our own country Davidson, Int. to N. T. 1868, ably assails them. See Gloag, Int. to Pauline Epistles, for a clear statement of the whole case.

[1] Barnabas. Compare as echo: C. 1. 5, δικαιοσύνη πίστεως ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἀγάπη. (Comp. 1 Tim. i. 5.)

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: 1 Clem. 1. 3, directions to old and young, &c. (1 Tim. v. 1; Titus ii. 6); 1 Clem. 2. 1 (1 Tim. vi. 8); c. 5. 6 (1 Tim. ii. 7); c. 44. 6 (1 Tim. iii. 9); c. 51. 1 (1 Tim. v. 14); c. 56. 1 (1 Tim. v. 21); c. 61. 2 (1 Tim. i. 17).

C. 29. 1. *Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.* (1 Tim. ii. 8.)

C. 54. 1. *Τίς οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖος; τίς εὔσπλαγχνος; τίς πεπληροφορημένος ἀγάπης; εἰπάτω· Εἰ δι' ἐμὲ στάσις καὶ ἔρις καὶ σχίσματα, ἐκχωρῶ, ἄπειμι οὗ ἐὰν βούλησθε, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους· μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰρηνευέτω μετὰ τῶν κατεσταμένων πρεσβυτέρων. Τοῦτο ὁ ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ μέγα κλέος ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποιήσεται, καὶ πᾶς τόπος δέξεται αὐτόν.* (1 Tim. iii. 13.)

Second Epistle.[2]

C. 12. 1. (comp. 17. 4.) *Ἐκδεχώμεθα οὖν καθ' ὥραν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ οἴδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. i. 10; iv. 1, 8; Titus ii. 13.)

C. 15. 1. *Οὐκ οἶμαι δὲ ὅτι μικρὰν συμβουλίαν ἐποιησάμην περὶ ἐγκρατείας, ἣν ποιήσας τις οὐ μετανοήσει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτὸν σώσει κἀμὲ τὸν συμβουλεύσαντα.* Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 16.

C. 19. 1. *Ὥστε, ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἀδελφαί, μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναγινώσκω ὑμῖν ἔντευξιν εἰς τὸ προσέχειν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, ἵνα καὶ ἑαυτοὺς σώσητε καὶ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα ἐν ὑμῖν.* Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16; iv. 16.[3]

C. 20. 6. *Τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ ἀοράτῳ.* (1 Tim. i. 17.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

Eph. 10. 1. *Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε.* (1 Tim. ii. 1.)

[2] Compare as echoes: 2 Clem. 8. 6 (1 Tim. vi. 14); c. 15. 1 (1 Tim. iv. 16); c. 20. 4. 5 (1 Tim. i. 17; ii. 1, &c.).

[3] This and the previous passages can scarcely be dissociated from 1 Tim. The preacher may or may not have been the Bishop or President (comp. Just. Apol. I. 67), but he was one who identified his own Christian life with that of his hearers. The μετὰ τὸν Θεόν seems to indicate that his exhortation followed the reading of the Divine word. In 2 Clem. 1. 1 he claims Christ as God the Judge of quick and dead: in 3. 1 he claims to know the Father of Truth through Him; and there is nothing to prevent—there is much in the tone of the Homily to warrant—our regarding this μετὰ τὸν Θεόν as a reference to the reading of New Testament Scripture.

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echoes: Eph. 20. 1. οἰκονομίας (1 Tim. i. 4). Ibid. 21. 2. ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν (1 Tim. i. 1). Magnes. 8. 1. μὴ πλανᾶσθε, κ.τ.λ. (1 Tim. i. 4).

4. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. 4. 1. *Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία· εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης.*[2] (1 Tim. vi. 7, 10.)

Ibid. 12. 3. Pro omnibus sanctis orate. Orate etiam pro regibus et potestatibus et principibus. (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.)

5. Letter to Diognetus.[1]

C. 11. 3. *Οἱ, πιστοὶ λογισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἔγνωσαν πατρὸς μυστήρια. Οὗ χάριν ἀπέστειλε λόγον, ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ· ὃς, ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθεὶς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεὶς, ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη.* (1 Tim. iii. 16.)

6. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 1. *Ὑπερβεβλημένως δὲ ἐνέσκηψεν ἡ ὀργὴ πᾶσα . . . εἰς Ἄτταλον Περγαμηνὸν τῷ γένει, στύλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀεὶ γεγονότα.* (1 Tim. iii. 15; comp. Apocal. iii. 12.)

Ibid. V. 3. *Ἀλκιβιάδου γάρ τινος ἐξ αὐτῶν, πάνυ αὐχμηρὸν βιοῦντος βίον, καὶ μηδενὸς ὅλως τὸ πρότερον μεταλαμβάνοντος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ καὶ ὕδατι χρωμένου, πειρωμένου τε καὶ ἐν τῇ εἱρκτῇ οὕτω διάγειν, Ἀττάλῳ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἀγῶνα ὃν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ ἤγνσεν, ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὅτι μὴ καλῶς ποιοίη ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοις τύπον*

Trall. 8. 2. ἀφορμάς (1 Tim. v. 14). Smyrn. 13. 1. παρθένους, τὰς λεγομένας χήρας (1 Tim. v. 3, 11). Ad Polyc. 4. χῆραι (1 Tim. v. 3); δούλους (1 Tim. vi. 1).

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echoes: C. 5. 1 (ὁμοίως διάκονοι ἄμεμπτοι, κ.τ.λ. (1 Tim. iii. 8, &c.); c. 11. 2 (1 Tim. iii. 5). Chapters 5 and 6 of Polycarp are as a whole an echo of Paul's injunctions. Only Presbyters and Deacons are spoken of as officebearers in Polycarp, and no notice is taken of preaching in the outline of their duties. It is to character more than to work that he looks.

[2] Schleiermacher says that this quotation is too vague to be accounted a real quotation, and at all events cannot resist the suspicion produced by the subsequent omission in Polycarp (when treating of wives and widows) of all allusion to this, the only Epistle in N. T. dealing with the subject of widows. See § 16, § 17. p. 229 of Berlin Edition of 1836. Arguments from such omission are always precarious. And moreover Polycarp in the next sentence (c. 4. 2) closely resembles 1 Tim. v. 14 and Titus ii. 4.

[1] Diognetus. Compare as an echo: C. 4. 6, θεοσέβεια (1 Tim. iii. 16).

σκανδάλου ὑπολιπόμενος. Πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε καὶ ἡὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ. (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4.)

7. Justin Martyr.[1]

Dial. c. 7. p. 225 B (compare also c. 35. p. 253 A). *Τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν.* (1 Tim. iv. 1.)

8. Hegesippus.[1]

Eus. H. E. III. 32.[2]

Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ (Ἡγήσιππος) διηγούμενος τὰ κατὰ τοὺς δηλουμένους, ἐπιλέγει ὡς ἄρα μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἐν ἀδήλῳ που σκοτίως φωλευόντων εἰσέτι τότε τῶν, εἰ καί τινες ὑπῆρχον, παραφθείρειν ἐπιχειρούντων τὸν ὑγιῆ κανόνα τοῦ σωτηρίου κηρύγματος. Ὡς δ' ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς διάφορον εἰλήφει τοῦ βίου τέλος, παρεληλύθει τε ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη τῶν αὐταῖς ἀκοαῖς τῆς ἐνθέου σοφίας ἐπακοῦσαι κατηξιωμένων, τηνικαῦτα τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύστασις, διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης· οἳ καὶ, ἅτε μηδενὸς ἔτι τῶν ἀποστόλων λειπομένου, γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τὴν ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν ἀντικηρύττειν ἐπεχείρουν.

[1] Justin. Compare as possible echoes: Dial. c. 7. p. 225 B; and the numerous passages where Θεοσέβεια and εὐσέβεια are used as in the Pastoral Epistles. The latter word, found (save once in Acts) only in those Epistles and 2 Peter in the N. T., is found in Justin with the same meaning. Thus Dial. c. 4. p. 222 E, δικαιοσύνη καὶ εὐσέβεια; Dial. c. 95. p. 323 A; Dial. c. 110. p. 337 A. So also Θεοσέβεια Dial. c. 110. p. 337 A, &c.

[1] Hegesippus. See p. 127 and note.

[2] Baur made a great deal of this passage. The chief point is the assertion that the Church remained a chaste virgin until after the death of the Apostles. Upon this Baur founded an argument for the late date of the Pastoral Epistles as they dealt with the corruption of the Church caused by heresy. But the reply is that Hegesippus only says that those who pervert the sound doctrine of the Gospel did not dare to show their heads freely until after the death of the Apostles. Baur also urges that Hegesippus, an Ebionite, was unlikely to quote the words of St Paul; but it is obvious that a forger in the Pauline interest was as little likely to quote Hegesippus. There is, moreover, no valid proof that Hegesippus was a foe of Paulinism. See Wieseler, die Briefe an Timotheus u. Titus, Supplement-Band III, Herzog's Encyclopaedie. He identifies the heresies of the Pastoral Epistles with the teachings of Apollonius of Tyana.

9. Syriac, Old Latin, and Muratorian Canon.

(See before, pp. 1, 2, 6, 7.)

10. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 16. *Πάντα γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐστιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, κόσμος τέλειος, πνεῦμα, δύναμις, λόγος.* (1 Tim. vi. 16.)

Ibid. c. 37. *Ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγοιμεν.* (1 Tim. ii. 2.)

11. Theophilus.[1]

Ad Autolyc. III. 14. *p.* 126. *Ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις καὶ εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ θεῖος λόγος ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.* (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2; comp. Tit. iii. 1.)

12. Irenaeus.

B. I. 1, 1. *Ἐπὶ*[1] *τὴν ἀλήθειαν παραπεμπόμενοί τινες ἐπεισάγουσι λόγους ψευδεῖς καὶ γενεαλογίας ματαίας, αἵτινες ζητήσεις μᾶλλον παρέχουσι, καθὼς ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν, ἢ οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει.* (1 Tim. i. 4.)

B. II. 14, 7. Et bene Paulus ait, "vocum novitates[2] falsae agnitionis." (1 Tim. vi. 20.)

13. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. II. 11. *p.* 457. *Περὶ ἧς ὁ ἀπόστολος γράφων· "Ὦ Τιμόθεε," φησὶν, "τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, ἣν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν." Ὑπὸ ταύτης ἐλεγχόμενοι τῆς φωνῆς οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων τὰς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἀθετοῦσιν ἐπιστολάς.*[1] (1 Tim. vi. 20. 21.)

[1] Theophilus. Add as echo: C. 1. 2 (1 Tim. i. 10).

[1] Irenaeus. Ἐπεί (?).

[2] Irenaeus seems to have read καινοφωνίας. So Chrysostom (2 Tim. ii. 10). The Latin Fathers (with the Vulgate) have *vocum novitates.*

Ibid. III. 12. p. 552. Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος, "βούλομαι οὖν," φησὶ, "νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν. Ἤδη γάρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ." (1 Tim. v. 14, 15.)

Prot. c. 9. *p.* 71. Θεοσέβεια δὲ πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμος, κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης. (1 Tim. iv. 8.)

14. Tertullian.

Adv. Marc. V. 21. See before (Philemon).

De praescript. haeret. c. 25. Et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: "O Timothee, depositum custodi." (1 Tim. vi. 20.) Et rursus: "Bonum depositum serva." (2 Tim. i. 14.)

De pudicit. c. 13. Plane idem Apostolus Hymenaeum et Alexandrum Satanae tradidit, ut emendarentur non blasphemare, sicut Timotheo suo scribit. (1 Tim. i. 20.)

15. Jerome.

Comment. in ep. ad Tit. prooem. (Vol. VII. p. 685.) Licet non sint digni fide, qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor et Basilidem et omnes haereticos, qui vetus laniant Testamentum: tamen eos aliqua ex parte ferremus, si saltem in novo continerent manus suas, et non auderent Christi (ut ipsi jactitant) boni Dei filii, vel Evangelistas violare, vel Apostolos. Nunc vero quum et Evangelia ejus dissipaverint, et Apostolorum epistolas, non Apostolorum Christi fecerint esse, sed proprias, miror quomodo sibi Christianorum nomen audeant vindicare. Ut enim de caeteris epistolis taceam, de quibus quicquid contrarium suo dogmati viderant, eraserunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas crediderunt, ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebraeos, et ad Titum quam nunc conamur exponere. Et si quidem redderent causas cur eas Apostoli non putarent; tentaremus aliquid respondere et forsitan satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero cum haeretica auctoritate pronuntient et dicant: "illa epistola Pauli est, haec non est," ea

[1] Clement. Marcion, Basilides, and others rejected all the Pastoral Epistles. Tatian rejected also the two Epistles to Timothy, but accepted that to Titus.

auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescunt falsa simulare. Sed Tatianus, Encratitarum patriarches, qui et ipse nonnullas Pauli epistolas repudiavit, hanc vel maxime, hoc est ad Titum, Apostoli pronunciandam credidit, parvi pendens Marcionis et aliorum, qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem. Scribit igitur Apostolus, o Paula et Eustochium, de Nicopoli, quae in Actiaco littore sita, nunc possessionis vestrae pars vel maxima est; et scribit ad Titum discipulum suum, et in Christo filium, quem Cretae reliquerat ad ecclesias instruendas: praecepitque ei, ut cum e duobus Artemas, seu Tychicus Cretam fuerit appulsus, ipse Nicopolim veniat. Justum quippe erat, ut ille qui dixerat, "Sollicitudo mea omnium ecclesiarum," et qui Evangelium Christi usque ad Illyricum de Jerosolymis proficiscens, fundaverat, non pateretur et sui et Titi absentia Cretenses esse desertos, a quibus primum idololatriae semina pullularunt: sed mitteret eis pro se et Tito Arteman, vel Tychicum, quorum doctrina et solatio confoverentur.

XXIII.

SECOND TIMOTHY.

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.)

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 7. 2. *Εἰ οὖν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος, καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν, ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἡμᾶς* (2 Tim. iv. 1; comp. Acts x. 42, and 1 Pet. iv. 5.)

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.[1]

Second Epistle.[2]

3. Ignatius.[1]

Smyrn. c. 9 and *c.* 10. *Κατὰ πάντα με ἀνεπαύσατε, καὶ ὑμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Ἀπόντα με καὶ παρόντα ἠγαπήσατε· ἀμείβοι ὑμῖν Θεὸς, δι᾽ ὃν πάντα ὑπομένοντες, αὐτοῦ τεύξεσθε. . . . ἀντίψυχον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμά μου καὶ τὰ δεσμά μου, ἃ οὐχ ὑπερηφανήσατε, οὐδὲ ἐπῃσχύνθητε. Οὐδὲ ὑμᾶς ἐπαισχυνθήσεται ἡ τελεία πίστις, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.* (2 Tim. i. 16, 18.)

4. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. c. 5. 2. *Καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νε-*

[1] Barnabas. Compare as echo: C. 4. 6 ἐπισωρεύοντας (2 Tim. iv. 3, &c.).

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: 1 Clem. c. 5. 6 (2 Tim. i. 11); c. 27. 3 (2 Tim. i. 6); c. 44. 5 (2 Tim. iv. 6); c. 44. 6 (2 Tim. i. 3); c. 55. 3 (2 Tim. ii. 1).

[2] Compare as echoes: 2 Clem. c. 7. 3 (2 Tim. iv. 7); c. 7. 4; 20. 2 (2 Tim. ii. 5).

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echoes: Eph. 2. 1. ἀναψύξαι (2 Tim. i. 16). Rom. 2. 2. σπονδισθῆναι (2 Tim. iv. 6). Ad Polycarp. 6. 2. ἀρέσκετε (2 Tim. ii. 4).

[1] Polycarp. As an echo, compare the Salutation with 2 Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 4.

κρῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ, εἴγε πιστεύομεν. (2 Tim. ii. 11, 12.)

C. 9. 2. *Οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησεν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναστάντα.* (2 Tim. iv. 10.)

5. Athenagoras.[1]

6. Irenaeus.

B. III. 3, 3. *Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν. Τούτου τοῦ Λίνου Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνηται.*[1] (2 Tim. iv. 21.)

B. III. 14, 1. 2 Tim. iv. 9, 10, 11. (Comp. before on Acts, p. 200.)

B. V. 20, 2. Tales sunt autem omnes haeretici . . . semper quaerentes et nunquam verum invenientes. (2 Tim. iii. 7.)

7. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. I. 1. *p.* 317. "*Σὺ οὖν ἐνδυναμοῦ,*" *καὶ Παῦλος λέγει,* "*ἐν χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι.*" *Καὶ πάλιν·* "*Σπούδασον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ, ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.* (2 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 15.)

Ibid. II. 11. *p.* 457. (See before, 1 Tim. p. 259.)

Ibid. III. 6. *p.* 536. *Ἴσμεν γὰρ καὶ ὅσα περὶ διακόνων γυναικῶν ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολῇ ὁ γενναῖος διατάσσεται Παῦλος.*

Protr. c. 9. *p.* 71. *Ταύτην ὁ Ἀπόστολος τὴν διδασκαλίαν θείαν ὄντως ἐπιστάμενος* "*Σὺ δὲ, ὦ Τιμόθεε,*" *φησὶν,* "*ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν, διὰ πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ.*" (2 Tim. iii. 15.)

[1] Athenagoras. Echo: 1. 1, Ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι τὸν νοῦν κατεφθαρμένον (2 Tim. iii. 8.)

[1] Irenaeus. From Eus. H. E. V. 6. Nicephor. H. E. IV. 15.

8. Tertullian.

De praescript. adv. haeret. c. 25. (See above on 1 Tim. p. 260.)

Scorpiace, c. 13. Vides quam martyrii definiat felicitatem, cui de gaudio mutuo acquirit solemnitatem, ut proximus denique voti sui factus est, qualiter de prospectu ejus exultans scribit Timotheo: "Ego enim jam libor, et tempus dijunctionis instat. Agonem bonum decertavi, cursum consummavi, fidem custodivi; superest corona, quam mihi Dominus illa die reddet, scilicet passionis." (2 Tim. iv. 6, 7, 8.)

9. Origen.

Comment. in Matth. series vet. interpretat. c. 117. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1769.) Item quod ait: "Sicut Jamnes et Mambres restiterunt Moysi," non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui suprascribitur: "Jamnes et Mambres liber." Unde ausi sunt quidam Epistolam ad Timotheum repellere, quasi habentem in se textum alicujus secreti, sed non potuerunt. (2 Tim. iii. 8.)

10. Eusebius.

H. E. II. 22. *Ἐν ᾧ δεσμοῖς ἐχόμενος τὴν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δευτέραν ἐπιστολὴν συντάττει, ὁμοῦ σημαίνων τήν τε προτέραν αὐτῷ γενομένην ἀπολογίαν, καὶ τὴν παραπόδας τελείωσιν. Δέχου δὴ καὶ τούτων τὰς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας· "Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου," φησὶν, "ἀπολογίᾳ οὐδείς μοι συμπαρεγένετο, ἀλλὰ πάντες με ἐγκατέλιπον, (μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθείη), ὁ δὲ Κύριός μοι παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέ με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ, καὶ ἀκούσωσι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Καὶ ἐῤῥύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος." Σαφῶς δὲ παρίστησι διὰ τούτων, ὅτι δὴ τὸ πρότερον, ὅπως ἂν τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ πληρωθείη ἐῤῥύσθη ἐκ στόματος λέοντος, τὸν Νέρωνα ταύτῃ, ὡς ἔοικε, διὰ τὸ ὠμόθυμον προσειπών. Οὐκ οὖν ἐξῆς προστέθεικε παραπλήσιόν τι τῷ, ῥύσεταί με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος. Ἑώρα γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τὴν ὅσον οὔπω μέλλουσαν αὐτοῦ τελευτήν. Διό φησιν ἐπιλέγων τῷ "καὶ ἐῤῥύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος," τὸ "ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν*

αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον," σημαίνων τὸ παραυτίκα μαρτύριον, ὃ καὶ σαφέστερον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ προλέγει γραφῇ φάσκων· "Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφέστηκεν." Νῦν μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐπιστολῆς τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, τὸν Λουκᾶν μόνον γράφοντι αὐτῷ συνεῖναι δηλοῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὴν προτέραν ἀπολογίαν οὐδὲ τοῦτον. Ὅθεν εἰκότως τὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον ὁ Λουκᾶς περιέγραψε τὸν χρόνον, τὴν μέχρις ὅτε τῷ Παύλῳ συνῆν ἱστορίαν ὑφηγησάμενος. Ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῖν εἴρηται παρισταμένοις, ὅτι μὴ καθ' ἣν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἀνέγραψεν ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ Παύλου, τὸ μαρτύριον αὐτῷ συνεπεράνθη. Εἰκὸς γέ τοι κατὰ μὲν ἀρχὰς ἠπιώτερον τοῦ Νέρωνος διακειμένου ῥᾷον τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος τοῦ Παύλου καταδεχθῆναι ἀπολογίαν. Προελθόντος δὲ εἰς ἀθεμίτους τόλμας μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιχειρῆσαι.[1]

Ibid. III. 4. Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀκολούθων τοῦ Παύλου, Κρίσκης μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς Γαλλίας[2] στειλάμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖται, Λῖνος δέ, οὗ μέμνηται συνόντος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολήν, πρῶτος μετὰ Πέτρον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἤδη πρότερον κληρωθεὶς δεδήλωται.

[1] Eusebius. Others read: ἐγχειρηθῆναι.
[2] See 2 Tim. iv. 2. Others read: εἰς Γαλλίαν, others: εἰς τὴν Γαλατίαν.

XXIV.

TITUS.

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.)

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 2. 7. *Ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν.* (Tit. iii. 1.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

4. Irenaeus.

B. I. 16. 3. *Ὅσοι δὲ ἀφίστανται τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τούτοις τοῖς γραώδεσι μύθοις πείθονται, ἀληθῶς αὐτοκατάκριτοι. Οὓς ὁ Παῦλος ἐγκελεύεται ἡμῖν μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτεῖσθαι.* (Tit. iii. 10.)

B. III. 3. 4. *Τοσαύτην οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν ἔσχον εὐλάβειαν, πρὸς τὸ μηδὲ μέχρι λόγου κοινωνεῖν τινι τῶν παραχαρασσόντων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὡς καὶ Παῦλος ἔφησεν· αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος, καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος.*[1] (Tit. iii. 10, 11.)

B. V. 15. 3. Jesus dixit ei: "Vade in Siloam, et lavare," simul et plasmationem et eam, quae est per lavacrum, regenerationem restituens ei. (Tit. iii. 5.)

[1] Barnabas. Echo: ἐλπὶς ζωῆς (Tit. i. 2, &c.).

[1] Clement. Echoes: 1 Clement 26. 1 and 35. 2 (Tit. ii. 10); c. 27. 2 (Tit. i. 2); c. 64 (Tit. ii. 14).

[1] Ignatius. Echoes: Magnes. 6. 2, τύπον (Titus ii. 7). Ibid. 8. 1, μυθεύμασιν (Titus i. 14; iii. 9). Trall. 3. 2, κατάστημα (Titus ii. 3).

[1] Irenaeus. The Greek from Eus. H. E. IV. 14.

5. Tatian.

Jerome, comment. in ep. ad Tit. prooem. (See before, 1 Tim. p. 260.)

6. Athenagoras.

II. 16. *Διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.* (Tit. iii. 5.)

7. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. II. 16. *p.* 95. *Ὅπως ᾖ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (Tit. iii. 5, 6.)

Ibid. III. 9. *p.* 122. *Ἀλλὰ νομοθέτην ἔχομεν τὸν ὄντως Θεὸν, ὃς καὶ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς δικαιοπραγεῖν καὶ εὐσεβεῖν καὶ καλοποιεῖν.* (Tit. ii. 11, 12.)

8. Justin Martyr.

Dial. c. 47. *p.* 266 *D. Ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμετρον τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* (Titus iii. 4.)

9. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. I. 13. p. 350. *Φασὶ δὲ Ἕλληνες μετά γε Ὀρφέα καὶ Λῖνον . . . ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ πρώτους θαυμασθῆναι τοὺς ἑπτὰ, τοὺς ἐπικληθέντας σοφούς. . . . τὸν δὲ ἕβδομον, οἱ μὲν Περίανδρον εἶναι λέγουσιν τὸν Κορίνθιον, οἱ δὲ Ἀνάχαρσιν τὸν Σκύθην, οἱ δὲ Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρῆτα, ὃν Ἑλληνικὸν οἶδε προφήτην, οὗ μέμνηται ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολῇ, λέγων οὕτως· Εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος προφήτης οὕτως· Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.* (Tit. i. 12.)

Prot. c. 1. *p.* 7. *Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν θεσπέσιον ἐκεῖνον τοῦ Κυρίου Ἀπόστολον, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπεφάνη, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα, ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζή-*

σωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ, καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.[1] (Tit. ii. 11-13.)

10. Tertullian.

De praescript. haeret. c. 6. Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, qui et alibi haereses inter carnalia crimina numerat, scribens ad Galatas, et qui Tito suggerit, hominem haereticum post primam correptionem recusandum, quod perversus sit ejusmodi et delinquat, ut a semetipso damnatus. (Tit. iii. 10, 11.)

Adv. Marcion. V. 21. (See below on Philemon.)

[1] Clement cites this Epistle repeatedly.

XXV.

PHILEMON.

(*COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.*)

1. Syriac and Old Latin Versions. Muratorian Canon.

(See before, pp. 1, 2, 6, 7.)

2. Tertullian.

Adv. Marcion. V. 21. Soli huic epistolae brevitas sua profuit,[1] ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit. Adfectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare.

3. Origen.

Homil. in Jerem. 19. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 501.) *Ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος, ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φιλήμονα ἐπιστολῇ τῷ Φιλήμονι περὶ τοῦ Ὀνησίμου· ἵνα μὴ κατ' ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ᾖ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἑκούσιον.* (v. 14.)

Matth. comment. series, tract. 33. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1707.) De Paulo autem dictum est ad Philemonem: "Nunc autem ut Paulus senex," cum esset adolescentulus quando Stephanus pro Christi testimonio lapidabatur, et ipse vestimenta servabat interficientium eum. (v. 9.)

Ibid. tract. 34. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1715.) Sicut Paulus ad Philemonem dicit: "gaudium enim magnum habuimus, et consolationem in charitate tua, quia viscera sanctorum requieverunt per te, frater." (v. 7.)

[1] Tertullian. The chief value of this passage is its explicit statement that the short Epistle to Philemon was in Marcion's Canon. Epiphanius makes the same statement. Haer. 42. 9. p. 310. See before, page 242. Irenaeus and Clem. Alex. do not cite it.

4. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 25. See before, p. 10.

5. Jerome.

Comment. in Ep. ad Philem. prooem. (Vol. VII. p. 741.) Qui nolunt inter epistolas Pauli eam recipere quae ad Philemonem scribitur, aiunt, non semper Apostolum, nec omnia, Christo in se loquente, dixisse: quia nec humana imbecillitas unum tenorem Sancti Spiritus ferre potuisset: nec hujus corpusculi necessitates sub praesentia Domini semper complerentur; velut disponere prandium, cibum capere, esurire, saturari, ingesta digerere, exhausta complere; taceo de caeteris, quae exquisite et coacte replicant. . . . His et caeteris istiusmodi, volunt autem epistolam non esse Pauli, quae ad Philemonem scribitur: aut etiam si Pauli sit, nihil habere quod aedificare nos possit; et a plerisque veteribus repudiatam, dum commendandi tantum scribatur officio, non docendi. At e contrario qui germanae auctoritatis eam esse defendunt, dicunt numquam in toto orbe a cunctis ecclesiis fuisse susceptam, nisi Pauli apostoli crederetur: et hac lege ne secundam quidem ad Timotheum, et ad Galatas eos debere suscipere, de quibus et ipse humanae imbecillitatis exempla protulerit. "Penulam quam reliqui Troade apud Carpum, veniens tecum affer." Et: "Utinam excidantur qui vos conturbant." Inveniri plurima et ad Romanos et ad caeteras ecclesias, maximeque ad Corinthios remissius et quotidiano pene sermone dictata, in quibus apostolus loquatur: "Caeteris autem ego dico, non Dominus." Quas et ipsas quia aliquid tale habeant, aut Pauli epistolas non putandas, aut si istae recipiuntur, recipiendam esse et ad Philemonem, ex praejudicio similium receptarum. Valde autem eos et simpliciter errare, si putent cibum emere, hospitium praeparare, vestimenta conquirere, esse peccatum. . . . Et quoniam Marcionis fecimus mentionem, Pauli esse epistolam ad Marcionem, saltem Marcione auctore doceantur. Qui cum caeteras epistolas ejusdem vel non susceperit, vel quaedam in his mutaverit atque corroserit, in hanc solam manus non est ausus mittere: quia sua illam brevitas defendebat. Sed mihi videntur dum epistolam simplicitatis arguunt,

suam imperitiam prodere; non intelligentes quid in singulis sermonibus virtutis ac sapientiae lateat. Quae, orantibus vobis, et ipso nobis Sancto Spiritu suggerente, quo scripta sunt, suis locis explanare conabimur. Si autem brevitas habetur contemtui, contemnatur Abdias, Naiim, Sophonias, et alii duodecim prophetarum, in quibus tam mira et tam grandia sunt quae feruntur, ut nescias utrum brevitatem sermonum in illis admirari debeas, an magnitudinem sensuum. Quod si intelligerent hi, qui epistolam ad Philemonem repudiant, numquam brevitatem despicerent; quae pro laciniosis legis oneribus, evangelico decore conscripta est, dum breviatum consummatumque sermonem facit Dominus super terram. Sed jam ipsa Apostoli verba ponenda sunt, quae ita incipiunt: *Paulus vinctus Christi Jesu, &c.*[1]

[1] Jerome. Similar testimony to the value and Pauline origin of this Epistle is given by Chrysostom, who like Jerome had to defend it against the charge of being on a subject below the great Apostle's notice.

XXVI.

HEBREWS.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XII.)

1. Barnabas.[1]

C. 5. 6. *Καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον, καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπεμείνεν.* (Heb. ii. 14, &c.)

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

Eus. H. E. III. 38. (See below.)

[1] The chief interest in regard to this Epistle attaches to the history of opinions on its Canonicity. See a very full account of the history of the circulation and acceptance of the Epistle in Bleek's Commentar zu dem Brief an die Hebräer (Einl. §§ 21-100), and (after Bleek) in Alford's Commentary, Vol. IV. Part 1. It was accepted as Paul's in Alexandria and throughout the Eastern Church from the earliest times downwards. In the Latin Church, on the other hand, it was not explicitly favoured by any writer of the Latin Church (either in Rome or Africa) until the fourth century, when the united influence of Jerome and Augustine gave it an apostolic place in the esteem of the Church. The undoubted instances of correspondence between the Epistle of Clement of Rome and Hebrews become therefore specially interesting, and they are pretty fully given in the text. That it was written to Alexandrian Jews led to its less immediate recognition in the Western Church than in Alexandria; its apparent countenance to the views of the Montanists (VI. 4-8) perhaps made the orthodox Latins reject it, so that the Montanists were afraid to quote it as an authority. Many authors (or scribes) have been suggested for it. Luther's idea that it might be Apollos has been largely adopted,—mainly in a kind of despair of finding any better solution of the difficulty.

[1] Barnabas has several passages which are parallel with the Epistle to the Hebrews rather than suggestive of it. Comp. c. 5 and 6 with Hebrews, especially c. 5. 1 with Heb. xii. 24; c. 6. 11 with Heb. vi. 6; and c. 19. 9, &c. with Heb. xiii. 7, &c. There is αἷμα τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ, Barn. 5. 1, which suggests Heb. xii. 24 and 1 Pet. i. 2.

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes (the number might be increased): 1 Clem. 1. 3, comp. Heb. xiii. 7; c. 2. 1, comp. Heb. xiii. 5; c. 16. 2, comp. Heb. i. 3 and viii. 1; c. 21. 1, comp. Heb. xiii. 21; c. 27. 2, comp. Heb. vi. 18 and x. 23; c. 27. 2. 4, comp. Heb. i. 3, vi. 18 (the use of λόγος not personification as in Wisdom xii. 12; xi. 22); c. 34. 1, comp. Heb. vi. 12 and xii. 12; c. 34. 5, comp. Heb. iii. 6; c. 51 3, comp. Heb. iii. 8; c. 64. 1, comp. Heb. xii. 9. Nothing can be learned from Clement as to the authorship.

C. 9. 2. *Ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τοὺς τελείως λειτουργήσαντας τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.* (Heb. xii. 1, 2.) *Λάβωμεν Ἐνὼχ, ὃς ἐν ὑπακοῇ δίκαιος εὑρεθεὶς μετετέθη, καὶ οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος. Νῶε πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν, καὶ διέσωσε δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ὁ δεσπότης τὰ εἰσελθόντα ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ζῶα εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν.* (Heb. xi. 5, 7.)[2]

C. 10. 1. *Ἀβραὰμ, ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς, πιστὸς εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὗτος δι᾽ ὑπακοῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅπως γῆν ὀλίγην, καὶ συγγένειαν ἀσθενῆ, καὶ οἶκον μικρὸν καταλιπὼν, κληρονομήσῃ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (Heb. xi. 7, 8, 9.)

C. 17. 1. *Μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα κἀκείνων, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· λέγομεν δὲ Ἠλίαν καὶ Ἐλισσαιέ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοὺς προφήτας, πρὸς τούτοις καὶ τοὺς μεμαρτυρημένους.* (Heb. xi. 37.)

C. 17. 5. *Μωϋσῆς πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐκλήθη.* Comp. c. 43. 1; Num. xii. 7. (Heb. iii. 2.)

C. 19. 1. *Τῶν τοσούτων οὖν καὶ τοιούτων οὕτως μεμαρτυρημένων, . . . ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπόν.* (Heb. xii. 1, 2; Phil. iii. 14; and 1 Cor. ix. 24.)

C. 21. 9. *Ἐρευνητὴς γάρ ἐστιν ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων· οὗ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν, καὶ ὅταν θέλῃ ἀνελεῖ αὐτήν.* (Heb. iv. 12.)

C. 36. 2. *Ὅσ ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσούτῳ μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν. Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως· "Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα," ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης· "Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε· αἴτησαι παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς." Καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· "Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου."* See also c. 16. 2. (Heb. i. 3, 5, 7, 13; and viii. 1.)

C. 45. 2. *Ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰς γραφὰς τὰς ἀληθεῖς τὰς διὰ*

[2] The thoughts in chapters 8, 9 and 12 of Clement, and the illustrations also, closely correspond with those in Hebrews.

τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. Ἐπίστασθε ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄδικον οὐδὲ παραπεποιημένον γέγραπται ἐν αὐταῖς. Οὐχ εὑρήσετε δικαίους ἀποβεβλημένους ἀπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν. Ἐδιώχθησαν δίκαιοι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνόμων· ἐφυλακίσθησαν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνοσίων· ἐλιθάσθησαν ὑπὸ παρανόμων· ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν μιαρὸν καὶ ἄδικον ζῆλον ἀνειληφότων. Ταῦτα πάσχοντες εὐκλεῶς ἤνεγκαν. &c. (Heb. xi. 32-39.)

C. 56. 2. Ἀναλάβωμεν παιδείαν, ἐφ' ᾗ οὐδεὶς ὀφείλει ἀγανακτεῖν, ἀγαπητοί. Ἡ νουθέτησις ἣν ποιούμεθα εἰς ἀλλήλους καλή ἐστιν καὶ ὑπεράγαν ὠφέλιμος· κολλᾷ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος· "Παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέν με ὁ Κύριος, καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ παρέδωκέν με. Ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται." (Ps. cxviii. 17; Prov. iii. 12.) . . . Βλέπετε, ἀγαπητοί, πόσος ὑπερασπισμός ἐστιν τοῖς παιδευομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου· πατὴρ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν παιδεύει εἰς τὸ νουθετηθῆναι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς ὁσίας παιδείας αὐτοῦ. (Heb. xii. 5, &c.)

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 15. Clemens scripsit ex persona Romanae Ecclesiae, ad Ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quae et in nonnullis locis publice legitur; quae mihi videtur characteri epistolae, quae sub Pauli nomine ad Hebraeos fertur, convenire. Sed et multis de eadem epistola, non solum sensibus, sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est.

Second Epistle.[3]

C. 11. 6. Ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ διψυχῶμεν, ἀλλὰ ἐλπίσαντες ὑπομείνωμεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν μισθὸν κομισώμεθα. Πιστὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος τὰς ἀντιμισθίας ἀποδιδόναι ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (Heb. x. 23. Comp. Mat. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6.)

3. Ignatius.[1]

[3] Compare as Echo: C. 13. 3 (Heb. v. 12.)

[1] Ignatius. Compare as Echoes:—Eph. 15. 3, οὐδὲν λανθάνει κ.τ.λ. (Heb. iv. 13); ibid. 16. 2, πόσῳ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ. (Heb. x. 28); Magnes. 8. 1, μὴ πλανᾶσθε κ.τ.λ. (Heb. xiii. 9).

4. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 12. 1. Deus autem et pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ipse sempiternus pontifex, Dei filius, Jesus Christus, aedificet vos in fide et *veritate et in omni mansuetudine, et sine iracundia et in patientia* &c. *et det vobis sortem et partem inter sanctos suos.* (Heb. iv. 14; vi. 20; vii. 3. Compare Acts xx. 32 and viii. 21.)

5. Hermas.[1]

Vis. III. 9. 7. *Νῦν οὖν ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις· Μὴ γίνεσθε ὅμοιοι τοῖς φαρμακοῖς.*

6. Justin Martyr.

Apol. I. 60. *p.* 93 *D.* (Comp. ibid. 12. p. 60 A.)

Ibid. 63. *p.* 95 *D.* *Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος.*[1] (Heb. iii. 1.)

Dial. c. 13. *p.* 229 *D.* *Πάλαι τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ σωτήριον λουτρὸν ἦν, ὃ εἶπε* (sc. *Ἡσαΐας*), *τὸ τοῖς μεταγινώσκουσι καὶ μηκέτι αἵμασι τράγων καὶ προβάτων ἢ σποδῷ δαμάλεως ἢ σεμιδάλεως προσφοραῖς καθαριζομένοις ἀλλὰ πίστει διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* (Heb. ix. 13, 14.)

Ibid. c. 96. *p.* 323 *C.* *Καὶ αἰώνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερέα καὶ βασιλέα καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι.*

Ibid. c. 113. *p.* 340 *D.* *Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ καὶ αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς ὑψίστου ὑπάρχων.* (Heb. v. 9, 10; vi. 20; vii. 12.)

[1] Hermas. Comp. Mand. XI. 12. πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοκῶν πνεῦμα ἔχειν ὑψοῖ ἑαυτὸν καὶ θέλει πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἔχειν. The reference (Vis. III. 9) apparently intimates that those who were preeminent in the church needed to be warned against contention and the evils which dissension brings. (Comp., as to Pharisees, Mat. xxiii. 6.) Prominence or eminence in the congregation is denoted by πρωτοκαθεδρίταις—see the reference in Mand. XI. 12—but it does not seem to have any exclusive bearing on *official* prominence. It might he social, or merely personal. In Heb. xiii. 7. 17 the word is ἡγούμενοι and seems to have a general reference to ecclesiastical rule, as probably προηγ. has here. See also Vis. II. 2; 1 Clem. 21. 6. 13. For Hermas' lists of church officials see Vis. III. 5. 1; Sim. IX. 15. 25. He sets preaching in a prominent position, especially in Sim. IX. 25.

[1] Justin. Only in Hebrews is Christ called ἀπόστολος, and Justin uses the word thrice in c. 60; besides once in c. 12.

7. Syriac and Old Latin Versions. Muratorian Canon.[1]

(See before, Section I.)

8. Irenaeus.

B. II. 30. 9. Solus hic Deus invenitur, qui omnia fecit, solus omnipotens, et solus pater condens et faciens omnia, et visibilia, et invisibilia, et sensibilia, et insensata, et coelestia, et terrena, "verbo virtutis suae." (Heb. i. 3.)

B. IV. 11. 4. Quae (munditiae exteriores) in figuram futurorum traditae erant, velut umbrae cujusdam descriptionem faciente lege, atque delineante de temporalibus aeterna, de terrenis coelestia. (Heb. x. 1; viii. 5; ix. 23. Comp. Col. ii. 17.)

B. V. 5. 1. *Ὅπου γε Ἐνὼχ εὐαρεστήσας τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν σώματι μετετέθη, τὴν μετάθεσιν τῶν δικαίων προμηνύων.* (Heb. xi. 5.)

Eus. H. E. V. 26. *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοῖς ἀποδοθεῖσιν Εἰρηναίου συγγράμμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, φέρεται . . . καὶ βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων, ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῆς λεγομένης Σολομῶντος Σοφίας μνημονεύει, ῥητά τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος.*[1]

[1] Syr., Old Lat. and Mur. Can. The Epistle is not named in the Muratorian Canon; unless it be glanced at in the "forged Epistle to the Alexandrians." See note on page 7.—In the Syriac it follows Timothy and Titus, from which position some have supposed that the compilers of the Canon did not accept it as Paul's, or they would have put it before the letters to individuals. But others say that it was put there because anonymous. The Old Latin Canon contained it in Tertullian's time (see below, page 278). In the Vatican MS (cod. B) there is a peculiarity. The Epistle to the Hebrews comes after Thessalonians (as it does in ℵ, A, C), but in the numbers upon the leaves Gal. ends with 58, Hebrews begins with 59, and Ephesians begins with 70. It thus appears that in the exemplar from which B was copied Hebrews was so placed as to show that it was ascribed to Paul. The MS ends with Heb. ix. 11, but the section is 64.

[1] Irenaeus nowhere quotes or refers to Hebrews in his book against Heresies. This passage in Eusebius is therefore the only evidence that he used it; but Eus. does not say that Irenaeus ascribed it to Paul. On the other hand Photius cod. 232 quotes from Stephen Gobar (sixth century) a statement: ὅτι Ἱππόλυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου, οὐκ ἐκείνου εἶναί φασι. Κλήμης μέντοι καὶ Εὐσέβιος, καὶ πολὺς ἄλλος τῶν Θεοφόρων πατέρων ὅμιλος, ταῖς ἄλλαις συναριθμοῦσι ταύτην ἐπιστολαῖς, καί φασιν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος μεταφράσαι τὸν εἰρημένον Κλήμεντα. Photius says that Hippolytus in his Church-History said: ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴ οὔκ ἐστι τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου. All this seems somewhat to qualify Jerome's statement (see below) that all the Greek and Oriental authors accepted the Epistle as Paul's. But indeed he qualifies it himself by saying that many of them ascribed it to Barnabas or to Clement.

9. Pantaenus.

Eus. H. E. V. 14. (See below, under Clem. Alex., where *ο μακάριος πρεσβύτερος* is Pantaenus.)

10. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 13. *Κέχρηται (Κλήμης) δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς (Στρωματεῦσιν) καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γραφῶν μαρτυρίαις, τῆς τε λεγομένης Σολομῶντος Σοφίας, καὶ τῆς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σιρὰχ, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, τῆς τε Βαρνάβα καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ Ἰούδα.*

Ibid. VI. 14. *Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν, Παύλου μὲν εἶναί φησι, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅθεν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὑρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν Πράξεων· μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ "Παῦλος ἀπόστολος," εἰκότως· Ἑβραίοις γὰρ, φησίν, ἐπιστέλλων, πρόληψιν εἰλιφόσι κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπτεύουσιν αὐτὸν, συνετῶς πάνυ οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέτρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θείς. Εἶτα ὑποβὰς ἐπιλέγει· "Ἤδη δὲ ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος,[2] ἐπει ὁ Κύριος ἀπόστολος ὢν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος, ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον, διά τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον τιμὴν, διὰ δὲ τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθνῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον."*

Phot. cod. 232. (See before, p. 276. Note on Irenaeus.)

Adumbrat. in 1 *Petr. Epist.* (See above, Acts, page 202.)

Strom. B. VI. 8. *p.* 771. *Ἐπεὶ καὶ Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς οὐ φιλοσοφίαν διαβάλλων φαίνεται, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Γνωστικοῦ μεταλαμβάνοντα ὕψους οὐκέτι παλινδρομεῖν ἀξιοῖ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλη-*

[1] Clement gives no Catalogue of his Canonical books in his extant works, but the two passages of Eusebius partly supply the want. It appears (from Eus. H. E. VI. 14, see page 74) that he commented on Hebrews, and his own explicit testimony (Strom. VI. 8. p. 771) is that Paul was the author. He quotes the Epistle as κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον (Strom. II. 2. p. 433), φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος (ibid. 4. p. 434).

[2] See the previous words of this passage p. 74. The part given here supplies the whole gap between ἐπιστολήν and Αὕτις on p. 75. The blessed Presbyter is Pantaenus, as appears from Eus. H. E. V. 11; VI. 13.

νικὴν "φιλοσοφίαν στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου" ταύτην ἀλληγορῶν στοιχειωτικήν τινα οὖσαν καὶ προπαιδείαν τῆς ἀληθείας. Διὸ καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις γράφων τοῖς ἐπανακάμπτουσιν εἰς νόμον ἐκ πίστεως "ἢ πάλιν," φησί, "χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς." Ὡσαύτως καὶ τοῖς ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ἐπιστρέφουσι Κολοσσαεῦσι· "βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης, κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν·" δελεάζων αὖθις εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἀναδραμεῖν, τὴν στοιχειώδη διδασκαλίαν. (Heb. v. 12; Col. ii. 8.)

Ibid. B. II. 22. p. 501. *"Ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος" ἕως "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." Τὰ ὅμοια τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡ πανάρετος σοφία λέγει.* (Heb. vii.)

11. Tertullian.[1]

De pudicit. c. 20. Disciplina igitur apostolorum proprie quidem instruit ac determinat principaliter sanctitatis omnis erga templum Dei antistitem et ubique de ecclesia eradicandum omne sacrilegium pudicitiae, sine ulla restitutionis mentione. Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a Deo satis auctorati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore: Aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus operandi potestatem? (1 Cor. ix. 6.) Et utique receptior

[1] Tertullian. This is the only passage in Tertullian where Hebrews is expressly quoted. It comes after a series of quotations (13-18) from the Pauline Epistles, and the Apocalypse and 1 John; to which the first words *Disciplina igitur apostolorum* apply. He elsewhere censures Marcion (Adv. Marc. V. 20) for excluding the Pastoral Epistles: but does not blame him for excluding Hebrews. The passage (Heb. vi. 4-8) here quoted is so much in his favour at the time (he was a Montanist when he wrote it) that his not claiming Pauline authorship or apostolical authority for the Epistle (it is by a *comes apostolorum*) must be regarded as specially significant. He even emphatically distinguishes between the apostolical writings (*disciplina magistrorum*) and this letter (which is only *de proximo jure*). The Muratorian Canon, the Old Latin, Irenaeus, Caius, and Tertullian show us how little favour the idea of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle found in the Western Church. On what ground Tertullian ascribed it to Barnabas is not known.

apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore mocchorum (i. e. Hermas). Monens itaque discipulos omissis omnibus initiis ad perfectionem magis tendere nec rursum fundamenta poenitentiae jacere ab operibus mortuorum, impossibile est enim, inquit, eos, qui semel inluminati sunt et donum caeleste gustaverunt et participaverunt Spiritum Sanctum et verbum Dei dulce gustaverunt, occidente jam aevo quum exciderint, rursus revocari in paenitentiam, refigentes cruci in semetipsos filium Dei et dedecorantes. . . . Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit, et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam moecho et fornicatori secundam paenitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat. Optime enim legem interpretabatur, et figuras ejus jam in ipsa veritate servabat.

12. Caius (about A.D. 200).

Eus. H. E. VI. 20. *Ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαΐου λογιωτάτου ἀνδρὸς διάλογος, ἐπὶ Ῥώμης καὶ Ζεφυρῖνον πρὸς Πρόκλον τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως ὑπερμαχοῦντα κεκινημένος· ἐν ᾧ τῶν δι' ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτειάν τε καὶ τόλμαν ἐπιστομίζων. Τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μόνων ἐπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου εἶναι.*[1]

13. Hippolytus.[1]

Περὶ *ἀναστάσεως* (Lagarde p. 89). *Διά τοι τοῦτο διδάσκομεν καὶ παρεγγυώμεθα πᾶσι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διδασκάλους ἡμῶν, πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑποκύπτειν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.*

[1] Caius. See before, Epistles of Paul, page 210. Photius says (cod. 48) of Caius: Καὶ κατὰ Πρόκλου δὲ σπουδαστοῦ Μοντανοῦ σπουδαίαν διάλεξιν συντεταχέναι, ἐν ᾗ τρὶς καὶ δέκα μόνας ἐπιστολὰς ἀριθμεῖται Παύλου οὐκ ἐγκρίνων τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους. It appears that Caius did not reckon the Epistle to Hebrews among Paul's genuine Epistles, because the Montanists (τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως) quoted it on their side. In this way Caius may be supposed to express along with the Muratorian Canon the unfavourable judgement of the Roman Church at the close of the second century.

[1] Hippolytus. Compare as Echoes: Ἀποδεικτικὴ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους (Lagarde p. 64)· Ἔξω τῆς πύλης (Heb. xiii. 12); Εἰς τὴν Σωσάνναν (Lagarde p. 149). Ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ Θεοῦ (Heb. x. 31).

Αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες. (Heb. xiii. 17.)

Περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου (Lagarde p. 118). *Δεῦτε οἱ ἀπόστολοι οἱ συγκακοπαθήσαντες . . . · δεῦτε οἱ ἱεράρχαι οἱ λειτουργήσαντές μοι . . . δεῦτε οἱ ὅσιοι οἱ "ἐν ὄρεσι καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς ἀσκήσαντες.* (Heb. xi. 38.)

14. Origen.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, page 9.)

Epist. ad Afric. Tom. I. p. 19. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 65.) *Ἀλλ' εἰκὸς πρὸς ταῦτά σε ζητήσειν τί δήποτε οὐ φέρεται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Δανιὴλ ἡ ἱστορία, εἰ, ὡς φῂς, τοιαῦτα περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ σοφοὶ αὐτῶν παραδιδόασι. Λεκτέον δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα, ὅτι ὅσα δεδύνηνται τῶν περισχόντων κατηγορίαν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἀρχόντων, καὶ κριτῶν, περιεῖλον ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ λαοῦ, ὧν τινα σώζεται ἐν ἀποκρύφοις. Καὶ τούτου παράδειγμα δώσομεν τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν ἱστορούμενα, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους Ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα, ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν φανερῶν βιβλίων γεγραμμένα· περὶ γὰρ τῶν προφητῶν διεξερχόμενος, καὶ ὧν πεπόνθασιν, ὁ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους γράψας φησίν. "Ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον." Πευσόμεθα γὰρ ἐπὶ τίνα ἀναφέρηται τὸ, "ἐπρίσθησαν," κατά τι ἔθος ἀρχαῖον οὐ μόνον Ἑβραϊκὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑλληνικὸν, πληθυντικῶς λεγόμενον περὶ ἑνός. Σαφὲς δ' ὅτι αἱ παραδόσεις λέγουσι πεπρίσθαι Ἡσαΐαν τὸν προφήτην· καὶ ἔν τινι ἀποκρύφῳ τοῦτο φέρεται· ὅπερ τάχα ἐπίτηδες ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ῥεραδιούργηται, λέξεις τινὰς τὰς μὴ πρεπούσας[2] παρεμβεβληκότων*

[1] Origen. See also the quotations from Origen pages 51, 52. Origen repeatedly quotes it as Paul's; and says that there are fourteen Pauline Epistles. In the Epistle to Africanus (A.D. 240) be intimates that he will prove that Paul was the author. But in the passage from his Homily (after A.D. 245) quoted by Eusebius (see page 9) he says that God only knows who wrote it. This last many hold to be his mature judgement. See Westcott on the Canon p. 330. Bleek, Einl. in d. N. T., § 193. p. 592 (Mangold's ed.). But the ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν may only mean the Amanuensis. This makes Origen consistent with himself; and corresponds with the suggestion of Eusebius H. E. III. 38 (see below). Methodius (end of the third century) Bishop of Olympus in Lycia and afterwards of Tyre (Jerome) seems to have ascribed the Epistle to Paul. He wrote against Origen. See Lardner's citation of him, and Bleek's objections (Hebräer § 37), which last seem to be well-founded.

[2] Another reading is προσηκούσας . . . ἵν' ὅλη ἀπιστηθῇ.

τῇ γραφῇ, ἵν' ἡ ὅλη ἀπιστηθῇ· ἀλλ' εἰκός τινα θλιβόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποδείξεως, συγχρήσασθαι τῷ βουλήματι τῶν ἀθετούντων τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν, ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην· πρὸς ὃν ἄλλων λόγων κατ' ἰδίαν χρήζομεν εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ εἶναι Παύλου τὴν Ἐπιστολήν.

De orat. Tom. I. p. 250. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 520.) Πολλάκις δέ μοι ἐπῆλθεν ἀπορεῖν συγκρούοντι δύο λέξεις ἀποστολικὰς, πῶς συντέλεια αἰώνων ἐστὶν, ἐφ' ᾗ ἅπαξ εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν Ἰησοῦς πεφανέρωται, εἰ μέλλουσιν εἶναι αἰῶνες μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπερχόμενοι. Ἔχουσι δὲ αἱ λέξεις αὐτοῦ οὕτως, ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους· νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται· ἐν δὲ τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους· ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλῆθος[3] τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. (Heb. ix. 26; Ephes. ii. 7.)

In Numer. hom. 3. Tom. II. p. 281. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 596.) Ipse ergo apostolorum maximus, qui sciret multas esse non solum in terris, sed et in coelis Ecclesias, ex quibus et septem quasdam Joannes enumerat: ipse tamen Paulus ostendere volens esse quandam praeter eas etiam primitivorum Ecclesiam, dicit ad Hebraeos scribens: "Non enim accessistis ad ardentem et tractabilem ignem, sed accessistis ad montem Sion etc." (Heb. xii. 18, &c.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 2. Tom. IV. p. 60. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 125.) Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους, ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλός φησιν· "Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν Υἱῷ, ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε." (Heb. i. 1, 2.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 20. Tom. IV. p. 350. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 648.) Τοῦτο γὰρ ἤδη καὶ δοκίμου τραπεζίτου ἔργον τυγχάνει, ὃν τέλειον ὀνομάζων οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι, καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους γεγραμμένου τοῦ· Τελείων δέ ἐστι ἡ στερεὰ τροφὴ, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. (Heb. v. 14.)

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. B. VII. Tom. IV. p. 599. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1111.) Ipsos quoque angelos, si ad sententiam Pauli

[3] Another reading is πλοῦτος.

respicias quae dicit, quia "omnes ministeriales sunt spiritus ad ministerium missi propter eos qui haereditatem capiunt salutis," intelliges tale aliquid gerere, et huic corruptioni esse subjectos: credo etiam ipsos non volentes, sed propter eum qui subjecit eos in spe. (Heb. i. 14.)

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. B. IX. Tom. IV. p. 659. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1235.) Sicut et ipse apostolus in aliis dicit: "*Perfectorum autem est cibus, eorum qui pro possibilitate sumendi exercitos habent sensus ad discretionem boni et mali.*" (Heb. v. 14.)

15. Dionysius of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 41. *Ἐξέκλινον δὲ καὶ ὑπανεχώρουν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις οἷς καὶ Παῦλος ἐμαρτύρησε, μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξαντο.* (Heb. x. 34.)

16. Cyprian.[1]

De exhort. mart. c. 11. Et apostolus Paulus, qui hujus legitimi numeri et certi (sc. num. septem) meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. Et in Apocalypsi Dominus mandata sua divina et praecepta coelestia ad septem ecclesias scribit.

Adv. Jud. I. 20. Item in Regum primo: "Sterilis septem peperit, et quae plurimos habebat filios infirmata est." Filii autem septem sunt ecclesiae septem. Unde et Paulus septem Ecclesiis scripsit, et Apocalypsis Ecclesias septem ponit, ut servetur septenarius numerus.

[1] Dionysius. See note on page 86. This testimony continues the history of the opinions entertained in Alexandria regarding the Pauline authorship. Alexander, a successor in the bishopric of Alexandria about A.D. 312, says (Theodoret H. E. I. 4) "Σύμφωνα γοῦν τούτοις βοᾷ καὶ ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος Παῦλος, φάσκων περὶ αὐτοῦ· ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν." (Heb. i. 2.) When we add to these the strong testimony of Athanasius (see before, page 15) it is clear that the testimony of the Alexandrian school (from Pantaenus downwards) to the Canonicity of Hebrews is consistent, and definite, Origen being the only (apparent) exception. On Origen see p. 280, note 1. Basilides rejected it. His position may be compared to that of Marcion in this respect.

[1] Cyprian. Though Cyprian had many opportunities of quoting Hebrews, he never quotes it, and he quotes all the other Pauline letters save Philemon. The passages in our text restrict Paul's letters to those addressed to seven churches *i.e.* Hebrews is not recognized. Along with the works of Cyprian is found a *Tractatus ad Novatianum haereticum* (author unknown) which does not allude to this Epistle, though its quotations from other books of scripture are numerous. So also the works of Novatian himself. Bleek (Hebräer) I. § 46.

17. Eusebius.[1]

H. E. II. 17. *Τάχα δ' εἰκὸς, ἃ φησιν ἀρχαίων παρ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι συγγράμματα, τά τε εὐαγγέλια καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφὰς διηγήσεις τέ τινας κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς τῶν πάλαι προφητῶν ἑρμηνευτικὰς, ὁποίας ἥ τε πρὸς Ἑβραίους καὶ ἄλλαι πλείους τοῦ Παύλου περιέχουσιν ἐπιστολαὶ, ταῦτα εἶναι.*

Ibid. III. 3. (See before on the Epistles, page 207.)

Ibid. III. 37. *. . . καὶ τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν τῇ ἀνωμολογημένῃ παρὰ πᾶσιν, ἣν ἐκ προσώπου τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορινθίων διετυπώσατο, ἐν ᾗ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθεὶς, ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ ῥητοῖς τισὶν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα. Ἔνθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγράφως ὡμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἑρμηνεῦσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφήν. Ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον εἴη ἂν ἀληθὲς, τῷ τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τήν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολὴν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόῤῥω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι.*

Ibid. VI. 13. (See before, under Clem. Alex.)

De martyr. Pal. c. 11. *Ἐκείνην δῆτα νοῶν περὶ ἧς εἴρηται τῷ Παύλῳ· ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν· καὶ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, καὶ πόλει Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ.* (Heb. xii. 22.)

Praepar. Ev. 12. 19. *Τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ λόγου σαφέστερον εἰπόντος· "Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ ἐλάτρευον τῶν ἐπουρανίων."* (Heb. viii. 5.)

Demonstr. Ev. 5. 3. *Ἐπάκουσον δὲ οἷα καὶ περὶ τῶνδε ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν, ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιδεῖξαι τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς βασιλείας τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, ἵνα διὰ δυο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεὸν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ προκαταφυγόντες, κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος.* (Heb. vi. 16-18.)

[1] Eusebius shows (H. E. III. 25) that while he was well aware of the controversies regarding the authorship and Canonicity of the Epistle, he himself admitted it as Paul's, though (III. 27) speaking of Clement or Luke as its translator.

Theodoreti argum. in Ep. ad Hebr. Vol. III. p. 393 (Paris 1642). Ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν γραμμάτων αἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετέλαχον ἐκκλησίαι, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς τὴν ὠφέλειαν καρποῦνται. Εἰ δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο ἱκανὸν πεῖσαι αὐτοὺς, Εὐσεβίῳ γοῦν ἐχρῆν πεισθῆναι τῷ Παλαιστινῷ, ὃν τῶν οἰκείων δογμάτων ἀποκαλοῦσι συνήγορον. Καὶ οὗτος γὰρ τοῦ θειοτάτου Παύλου τήνδε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡμολόγησεν εἶναι, καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ἅπαντας ταύτην περὶ αὐτῆς ἔφησεν ἐσχηκέναι τὴν δόξαν.

Photii cod. 232. (See before, Note 1 on Irenaeus, page 276.)

18. Athanasius.[1]

Canon of Athanasius, see before p. 13.

De Decretis Nicenae Synodi c. 17. Vol. I. p. 223. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 453.) Ὁ δὲ Ἀπόστολος βλέπων τὴν χεῖρα, τὴν σοφίαν, τὸν λόγον, αὐτὸν ὄντα τὸν Υἱόν, φησι· Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις· ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν Υἱῷ, ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησε τοὺς αἰῶνας· καὶ πάλιν· Εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ. (Heb. i. 1, 2.)

Ibid. c. 18. Vol. I. p. 224. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 456.) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους φησίν· Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι. (Heb. xi. 3.)

Ibid. c. 19. Vol. I. p. 225. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 449.) Ἀμέλει τὰ πάντα λέγων ὁ Παῦλος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐθὺς ἐπήγαγε· Καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα· ἵνα δείξῃ πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἄλλος μέν ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς πάντων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένων. (Heb. i.)

19. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catechis. IV. (See before, p. 19.)

20. Epiphanius.[1]

Haeres. I. t. 2. *h.* 26. *p.* 98. Πόσα δὲ ἄλλα ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, ὡς

[1] Athanasius. References to Benedictine ed. 1598.

[1] Epiphanius. In addition to Cyril and Epiphanius many other testimonies

τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέγοντος· ἡ μὲν ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾶ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ Κυρίῳ. (1 Cor. vii. 34.) Τοῦτο δέ φησι δεῖξαι τὴν ἁγνείαν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιτρεπόμενος οὐ παρέργως. Ἔπειτα δὲ περὶ τῶν τὸν γάμον ἐχόντων τὸν σεμνὸν λέγει· Τίμιος ὁ γάμος, καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος, πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός. (Heb. xiii. 4.)

Haeres. I. t. 3. *h.* 42. *p.* 373. Οὕτως γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Μαρκίωνι κεῖται (*i.e.* Philemon as the ninth, between Colossians and Philippians). Παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ ἐσχάτη κεῖται· ἔν τισι δὲ ἀντιγράφοις τρισκαιδεκάτη πρὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τέτακται· ἄλλα δὲ ἀντίγραφα ἔχει τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δεκάτην πρὸ τῶν δύο τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, καὶ Τίτον, καὶ Φιλήμονα.

Haeres. II. t. 2. *h.* 69. *p.* 760. Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους φημὶ, (Οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ) ἀπωθοῦνται, φύσει αὐτὴν ἀναιροῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, καὶ λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Haeres. III. t. 1. *h.* 70. *p.* 815. Ἅμα δὲ καὶ μερισμοὺς ἔχει· Θεὸς δὲ ἀμέριστός ἐστι. Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόστολος· Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργὴς, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διϊκνούμενος μέχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ μυελῶν· καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων, καὶ ἐννοιῶν. Καὶ οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

Haeres. III. t. 1. *h.* 76. *p.* 941. (See above, p. 21.)

21. Theodoret.

Interpret. Ep. ad Hebr. Argum. Vol. III. p. 393 (Ed. Paris 1542). Θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν δρῶσιν οἱ τὴν Ἀρειανικὴν εἰσδεξάμενοι νόσον, κατὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν λυττῶντες γραμμάτων, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποκρίνοντες, καὶ νόθον ταύτην

of Eastern writers might be cited. From the fourth century it is with increasing cordiality recognized as Paul's. Thus the Laodicene Council (see before, p. 18), in the decree which may be ascribed to about this time, numbers fourteen Epistles of Paul; Gregory of Nazianzum (died 389) says δέκα δὲ Παύλου τέσσαρές τ' ἐπιστολαί. Amphilochius of Iconium, contemporary of Gregory, says that Paul wrote Hebrews, and that some who call it νόθον are men οὐκ εὖ λέγοντες· γνησία γὰρ ἡ χάρις. The Apostolical Canons count fourteen Epistles of Paul; and Basil the Great (died 379) and his brother Gregory of Nyssa distinctly ascribe it to Paul. Chrysostom (died 407) not only often quotes the Epistle as Paul's, but even discusses questions concerning it, without once alluding to any doubt of Paul being the author. See Bleek (Hebräer) I. §§ 41. 42.

ἀποκαλοῦντες. Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰς γλώττας κινοῦντες τί οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιεν κατὰ τῶν εὐνων αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοφώνων τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύκων; αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ δεσπότου φωνή· Εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν. Ἔδει δὲ αὐτοὺς, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τοῦ χρόνου γοῦν αἰδεσθῆναι τὸ μῆκος, ἐν ᾧ τήνδε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγινώσκοντες διετέλεσαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἱ τρόφιμοι. Ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τῶν Ἀποστολικῶν γραμμάτων αἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετέλαχον ἐκκλησίαι, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς τὴν ὠφέλειαν καρποῦνται· εἰ δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο ἱκανὸν πεῖσαι αὐτοὺς, Εὐσεβίῳ γοῦν ἐχρῆν πεισθῆναι τῷ Παλαιστινῷ, ὃν τῶν οἰκείων δογμάτων ἀποκαλοῦσι συνήγορον· καὶ οὗτος γὰρ τοῦ θειοτάτου Παύλου τήνδε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡμολόγησεν εἶναι, καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ἅπαντας ταύτην περὶ αὐτῆς ἔφησεν ἐσχηκέναι τὴν δόξαν. Ἀλλ' οὗτοι πᾶσιν ἐῤῥῶσθαι φράσαντες, ἀναίδην πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν διαμάχονται, τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς θεολογίας, ᾗ τὸ προοίμιον κατεκόσμησε, τὴν αἴγλην οὐ φέροντες. Ἀντιλέγειν γὰρ οὐ δυνάμενοι πρὸς τὰ διαῤῥήδην περὶ τῆς τοῦ μονογένους εἰρημένα θεότητος, πᾶσαν ἐκβάλλειν ἐτόλμησαν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, καίτοι καὶ τῶν δογμάτων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐνθυμημάτων, πολλὴν συγγένειαν πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἐχόντων ἐπιστολάς. Πρόσχημα δὲ τῇ κατηγορίᾳ περιτιθέασι, τὸ μὴ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν προσηγορίαν ὁμοίως ἐγκεῖσθαι τῷ προοιμίῳ. Ἔδει δὲ αὐτοὺς συνιδεῖν, ὡς τῶν ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν ἐξ Ἰουδαίων πεπιστευκότων Ἀπόστολος ἐκεχειροτόνητο. . . . τούτου δὴ χάριν τοῖς μὲν ἐξ ἐθνῶν πεπιστευκόσιν ἐπιστέλλων, καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν προστέθεικε, καὶ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν ἀξίαν προστέθεικεν, ὡς διδάσκαλος μαθηταῖς ἐπιστέλλων. Ἑβραίοις δὲ γράφων, ὧν οὐκ ἐνεχειρίσθη τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, γυμνὴν τῶν ἀξιωμάτων εἰκότως τὴν διδασκαλίαν προσήνεγκεν. Ὑπὸ γὰρ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων προμήθειαν ἐτέλουν. Ὅτι δὲ τῆς πνευματικῆς χάριτος ἀνάπλεως ἡ ἐπιστολὴ, καὶ οὐδὲ τὴν τυχοῦσαν παρέχουσα διαβολῆς ἀφορμὴν, ἡ κατὰ μέρος ἑρμηνεία διδάξει σαφέστερον. . . . Γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὴν τῇ Ἑβραίων φωνῇ· ἑρμηνευσθῆναι δὲ αὐτήν φασιν ὑπὸ **Κλήμεντος.**

22. Jerome.[1]

De Vir. Ill. c. 5. (See before, Epistles of Paul, p. 214.)

[1] Jerome's view on the whole is that the Pauline authorship was not beyond

Ad Paulin. de Stud. Script. (Vallars. Vol. I. c. 8. p. 278.) Paulus Apostolus ad septem Ecclesias scribit, (octava enim ad Hebraeos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur.)

Epist. ad Dardanum. (Vallars. Vol. I. c. 3. p. 965.) Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc Epistolam quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab Ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro Ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis Scriptoribus, quasi Pauli Apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabae, vel Clementis arbitrentur: et nihil interesse, cujus sit, quum Ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie Ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas; nec Graecorum quidem Ecclesiae Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utrumque suscipimus; nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utantur exemplis, sed quasi canonicis et ecclesiasticis.

Comment. in Isaiae proph. iii. 6. (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 91.) Unde et Paulus Apostolus in epistola ad Hebraeos, quam Latina consuetudo non recipit: "Nonne omnes," inquit, "ministri sunt spiritus &c.?"

Comment. in Ep. ad Tit. Prooem. (See above, on 1 Tim. p. 260.)

In Jerem. Book VI. c. 31. (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 1074.) Hoc testimonio Apostolus Paulus, sive quis alius scripsit Epistolam, usus est ad Hebraeos.

In Matth. Book IV. c. 26. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 212.) Nam

doubt. He usually cites the Epistle as Paul's; but often expresses a doubt; and this throughout his writings at all periods of his life. The quotation in the text from his letter to Dardanus gives a fair view of his general position. His contemporary Augustine testifies to the Pauline authorship on the whole. He was present at the Council of Carthage A.D. 397 (see before, p. 20) at which it was reckoned as Paul's, but separately from the thirteen. In one remarkable passage (see before, p. 23) he counts fourteen Epp. of Paul, without question putting Hebrews at the end. Though he does not always say the Ep. is Paul's, he does not admit doubts of it further than might be inferred from such phrases as "*Epistola quae scribitur ad Hebraeos*" or "*Epistola ad Hebraeos.*" In his De Peccat. merit. et remiss. I. c. 27 he says: "*Ad Hebraeos quoque epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit . . . magisque me movet auctoritas Ecclesiarum Orientalium, quae hanc quoque in canonicis habent, quanta pro nobis testimonia contineat, advertendum est.*"

et Paulus in epistola sua, quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent &c.

Comm. in Ep. ad Galat. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 374.) Unde et nos possumus intelligere, Joannem quoque baptistam et apostolum appellandum, siquidem ait scriptura: "Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Joannes:" et in Epistola ad Hebraeos propterea Paulum solita consuetudine nec nomen suum, nec Apostoli vocabulum praeposuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus: *Habentes ergo principem Sacerdotem, et Apostolum confessionis nostrae Jesum* (Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14); nec fuisse congruum, ut ubi Christus Apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus Apostolus poneretur.

XXVII.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.[1]

1. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. IV. 15. *p.* 606. *Κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν καθολικὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἁπάντων "σὺν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος" τῇ γεγραμμένῃ μὲν ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων, διακομισθείσῃ δὲ εἰς τοὺς πιστοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ διακονοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου.*

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. *Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών· τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολὰς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.*

[1] The origin and meaning of the term Catholic are obscure. The seven Epistles which are now so named are usually found in MSS of the New Testament after the Acts and before the Pauline Epistles. In ℵ they immediately precede the Apocalypse. For much interesting information as to the relative order in which they are severally found in MSS and Catalogues see Volkmar's Anhang to Credner's Geschichte, § 196. It appears from the following extracts that Clement used the word "Catholic" to denote the general destination of the Epistle in Acts xv; and that he (or Eusebius for him) had the same meaning in view when speaking of Jude and the rest; Origen also (applying it to Barnabas and some that are Canonical) has the same meaning (see reff. in our text); and this meaning seems to have prevailed ever since. Eus. H. E. III. 3. (see before, page 207) does not necessarily give a different rendering, for ἐν καθολικοῖς παραδεδομένα may mean "handed down among Catholic Christians." Oecumenius (Proleg. in Ep. Jacob.) says καθολικαὶ λέγονται αὗται οἱονεὶ ἐγκύκλιοι, which is the same thing. The two smaller Epistles of John do not come under the name of General Epistles, but they were at an early date supposed to be general; the Elect lady and Gaius being supposed to denote the Christian Church. Photius says of Clement that his Stromateis are Interpretations "of the Epistles of the divine Paul and the Catholic Epistles." Cassiodorus (sixth century), Div. Lit. c. 8 (see below on 2 Peter under Clem. Alex.), applies the term *Epistolae canonicae* to those Epistles, and this became the ordinary phrase in the Latin Church: but this seems to intimate that they are undoubtedly recognized by the Church, and does not necessarily distinguish them from Paul's. Eusebius II. E. II. 23 (see below, on James) was the first to treat them as a collection.

3. Origen.[1]

C. Celsum I. 63. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 777.) *Γέγραπται δὴ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ.*
Selecta in Psalm. (See below, 1 Pet.)
Comment. in Joann. (See below, 1 Pet.)
De orat. (See below, 1 John.)
Comment. in Joann. (See below, 1 John.)
Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. (See below, Jude.)
Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 8.)

4. Dionysius of Alexandria.

Eus. H. E. VII. 25. *Ἡ Ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολική.* (See below, on the Apocal.)

5. Eusebius.

H. E. II. 23. (See below, on James.)
Ibid. III. 3. (See before, "The Epistles," page 207.)
Ibid. VI. 14. (See before, on Clem. Alex., pages 74, 277.)

6. Epiphanius.

Haeres. 51. (See below, on the Apocal.)

7. Jerome.

Prolog. 7. *epist. canonic.* (Vallars. Vol. X. p. 1057) Non idem ordo est apud Graecos, qui integre sapiunt, et fidem rectam sectantur, Epistolarum septem, quae Canonicae nuncupantur, qui in Latinis Codicibus invenitur: ut, quia Petrus primus est in numero Apostolorum, primae sint etiam ejus Epistolae in ordine caeterarum. Sed sicut Evangelistas dudum ad veritatis lineam correximus: ita has proprio ordini, Deo nos juvante, reddidimus. Est enim prima earum una Jacobi: Petri duae: Johannis tres: et Judae una. Quae si, ut ab eis digestae sunt, ita quoque ab

[1] Origen. In the following passages Origen means "general" when he says Catholic.

interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent, nec sermonum sese varietas impugnaret: illo praecipue loco ubi de unitate Trinitatis in prima Johannis Epistola positum legimus. In qua etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus multum erratum esse a fidei veritate comperimus: trium tantum vocabula, hoc est, aquae, sanguinis et spiritus, in sua editione ponentes; et Patris, Verbique, ac Spiritus testimonium omittentes: in quo maxime et fides Catholica roboratur, et Patris et Filii ac Spiritus Sancti una divinitatis substantia comprobatur. In caeteris vero Epistolis, quantum a nostra aliorum distet Editio lectoris prudentiae derelinquo. Sed tu, virgo Christi Eustochium, dum a me impensius Scripturae veritatem inquiris, meam quodam modo senectutem invidorum dentibus corrodendam exponis, qui me falsarium corruptoremque sanctarum pronuntiant Scripturarum. Sed ego in tali opere nec aemulorum meorum invidentiam pertimesco: nec sanctae Scripturae veritatem poscentibus denegabo.

Ad Paulin. de stud. script. (See before, p. 22.)

XXVIII.

JAMES.[1]

(*COMPARE SECTIONS I-III.*)

1. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.

C. 10. 1, 7. Ἀβραὰμ, ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς, πιστὸς εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ. . . . Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ υἱὸς ἐν γήρᾳ, καὶ δι' ὑπακοῆς προσήνεγκεν αὐτὸν θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς ἓν τῶν ὀρέων ὧν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ. (James ii. 21-23.)

C. 12. 1. Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη. (James ii. 25; Heb. xi. 31.)

C. 17. 2. Ἐμαρτυρήθη δὲ μεγάλως Ἀβραὰμ καὶ φίλος προσηγορεύθη τοῦ Θεοῦ. (James ii. 23.)

C. 23. 1. Ὁ οἰκτίρμων κατὰ πάντα καὶ εὐεργετικὸς πατὴρ ἔχει σπλάγχνα ἐπὶ φοβουμένους αὐτὸν, ἡπίως τε καὶ προσηνῶς τὰς χάριτας αὐτοῦ ἀποδιδοῖ τοῖς προσερχομένοις αὐτῷ ἁπλῇ δια-

[1] This Epistle was accepted in the Eastern Church from the first. It is in the Peshito version; but not in the Muratorian list; and not in the majority of MSS of the Old Latin. The references given from Clem. Rom. are not very secure, although some of them (especially perhaps c. 17. 2) may be kept in mind. It seems impossible to doubt that Hermas had it in view; and the first passage from Irenaeus is significant. About Origen there can be no doubt whatever as regards the Epistle, although doubt may be thrown on the passages which identify its writer with the Lord's brother, inasmuch as they are only in the Latin of Rufinus. Nothing can be made of Tertullian: but on the other hand Hippolytus, in his solitary quotation, is significantly explicit. Eusebius tells as a matter of fact that some counted it spurious, and that there was a lack of early testimony to it; but he himself quotes it as Apostolic. He seems to have believed that there were three of the name of James, famous in the early Church. This is a subject much discussed, on which this is not the place to enter. It is more to our purpose to draw the student's attention to the correspondence between James and the Sermon on the Mount; and between James and 1 Peter. This twofold relation seems to point to James being one of those who saw and heard the Lord in the flesh. Both James and 1 Peter were addressed to the Jews of the dispersion; and some have attributed to this fact the slowness of the Christian Churches, especially in the West, to receive them. Perhaps in those days, as at the Reformation, its doctrine was supposed to conflict with that of St Paul. Luther could not endure it. He called it "straw."

νοίᾳ. Διὸ μὴ διψυχῶμεν, μηδὲ ἐνδαλλέσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὑπερβαλλούσαις καὶ ἐνδόξοις δωρεαῖς αὐτοῦ. Πόῤῥω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει· "Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ ψυχῇ, οἱ λέγοντες· Ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συνβέβηκεν." Ὦ ἀνόητοι, συμβάλετε ἑαυτοὺς ξύλῳ· λάβετε ἄμπελον· πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ, εἶτα βλαστὸς γίνεται, εἶτα φύλλον, εἶτα ἄνθος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὄμφαξ, εἶτα σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυῖα.[1] (James i. 5, 9; v. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4.)

C. 30. 1. *Ἁγίου οὖν μερὶς ὑπάρχοντες ποιήσωμεν τὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ πάντα, φεύγοντες καταλαλιὰς, μιαράς τε καὶ ἀνάγνους συμπλοκὰς, μέθας τε καὶ νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ βδελυκτὰς ἐπιθυμίας, μυσερὰν μοιχείαν, βδελυκτὴν ὑπερηφανίαν. "Θεὸς γὰρ," φησὶν, "ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν."*[2] (James iv. 2-6; comp. 1 Pet. v. 5.)

C. 31. 2. *Τίνος χάριν ηὐλογήθη ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ; οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας; Ἰσαὰκ μετὰ πεποιθήσεως γινώσκων τὸ μέλλον, ἡδέως προσήγετο θυσία.* (James ii. 21.)

C. 38. 2. *Ὁ σοφὸς ἐνδεικνύσθω τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐν λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.* (James iii. 13.)

Second Epistle.[3]

2. Hermas.

Vis. III. 9. 5. *Βλέπετε τὴν κρίσιν τὴν ἐπερχομένην. Οἱ ὑπερέχοντες οὖν ἐκζητεῖτε τοὺς πεινῶντας ἕως οὔπω ὁ πύργος ἐτελέσθη· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τελεσθῆναι τὸν πύργον θελήσετε ἀγαθοποιεῖν καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε τόπον. Βλέπετε οὖν ὑμεῖς οἱ γαυρούμενοι ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ ὑμῶν μήποτε στενάζουσιν οἱ ὑστερούμενοι, καὶ ὁ στεν-*

[1] Clement of Rome. This corresponds in idea with the passages marked in N. T. but as a whole it seems to be from some Apocryphal source unknown in our day. See Hilg., Lightf. or Gebh. & Harn. *in loc.* Compare Hermas Vis. II. 3; and 2 Clem. 11. 2.

[2] In Prov. iii. 34 it reads Κύριος ὑπερηφάνοις κ.τ.λ. In James and Peter (see Clement) it reads ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις κ.τ.λ. The Hebrew has simply הוּא "he" see Lightf. *in loc.*

[3] The following may be compared as possible echoes: C. 8. 6 (James i. 27), c. 15. 1 (James v. 20).

αγμὸς αὐτῶν ἀναβήσεται πρὸς τὸν Κύριον καὶ ἐκκλεισθήσεσθε μετὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑμῶν ἔξω τῆς θύρας τοῦ πύργου.[1] (James v. 1 &c.)

Mand. II. 2. *Πρῶτον μὲν μηδενὸς καταλάλει, μηδὲ ἡδέως ἄκουε καταλαλοῦντος· εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ σὺ ὁ ἀκούων ἔνοχος ἔσῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ καταλαλοῦντος, ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς τῇ καταλαλιᾷ ἣ ἂν ἀκούσῃς· πιστεύσας γὰρ καὶ σὺ αὐτὸς ἕξεις κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Οὕτως οὖν ἔνοχος ἔσῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ καταλαλοῦντος. Πονηρὰ ἡ καταλαλιά, ἀκατάστατον δαιμόνιόν ἐστιν, μηδέποτε εἰρηνεῦον, ἀλλὰ πάντοτε ἐν διχοστασίαις κατοικοῦν. Ἀπέχου οὖν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐθηνίαν πάντοτε ἕξεις μετὰ πάντων.* (James i. 8; iii. 8; iv. 11 &c.)

Mand. IX. 1.[2] *Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ τὴν διψυχίαν καὶ μηδὲν ὅλως διψυχήσῃς αἰτήσασθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγων ἐν σεαυτῷ ὅτι πῶς δύναμαι αἰτήσασθαί τι παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ λαβεῖν, ἡμαρτηκὼς τοσαῦτα εἰς αὐτόν; μὴ διαλογίζου ταῦτα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου ἐπίστρεψον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον, καὶ αἰτοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀδιστάκτως, καὶ γνώσῃ τὴν πολυσχλαχνίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπῃ, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἴτημα τῆς ψυχῆς σου πληροφορήσει.* (James i. 4 &c.; iv. 6 &c.; v. 11.)

Mand. XI. 5. *Πᾶν γὰρ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δοθὲν οὐκ ἐπερωτᾶται, ἀλλὰ ἔχον τὴν δύναμιν τῆς θεότητος ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ λαλεῖ πάντα, ὅτι ἄνωθέν ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θείου πνεύματος. Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐπερωτώμενον καὶ λαλοῦν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίγειόν ἐστι καὶ ἐλαφρὸν, δύναμιν μὴ ἔχον· καὶ ὅλως οὐ λαλεῖ ἐὰν μὴ ἐπερωτηθῇ.* (James i. 17; iii. 15.[3]; and see also 2 Tim. iv. 3.)

Mand. XI. 9. *Ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἔχων τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον εἰς συναγωγὴν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων τῶν ἐχόντων πίστιν Θείου πνεύματος, καὶ ἔντευξις γένηται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων, τότε ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος ὁ κείμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν πληροῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ πληρωθεὶς ὁ*

[1] Hermas. The whole of Vis. III. 9 reminds of St James, and of the N. T. generally.

[2] Comp. also for διψυχία Vis. II. 2. 4. Mand. IX. 11. Mand. XI. Sim. IV. 6. See for πολυσπλαχνία Sim. V. 4. 4. Vis. I. 3. 2.

[3] Comp. Mand. IX. 11, ἡ πίστις ἄνωθέν ἐστι παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἔχει δύναμιν μεγάλην· ἡ δὲ διψυχία ἐπίγειον πνεῦμά ἐστιν παρὰ τοῦ διαβόλου, δύναμιν μὴ ἔχουσα. See note 2 for further references.

ἄνθρωπος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ λαλεῖ εἰς τὸ πλῆθος καθὼς ὁ Κύριος βούλεται.

Mand. XII. 1. 1. *Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν πονηρὰν, ἔνδυσαι δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ σεμνήν· ἐνδεδυμένος γὰρ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ταύτην μισήσεις τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ χαλιναγωγήσεις αὐτὴν καθὼς βούλει. Ἀγρία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ πονηρὰ καὶ δυσκόλως ἡμεροῦται· φοβερὰ γάρ ἐστι καὶ λίαν τῇ ἀγριότητι αὐτῆς δαπανᾷ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους·* See also Vis. I. 1. 8. (James i. 15; i. 26; iv. 4.)

Mand. XII. 5. 2. *Δύναται ὁ διάβολος ἀντιπαλαῖσαι, καταπαλαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται. Ἐὰν οὖν ἀντισταθῆτε αὐτῷ, νικηθεὶς φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν κατησχυμμένος.* (James iv. 7. 12.)

Mand. XII. 6. 3.[4] (James iv. 12.) See before, Ap. Fath. and Synopt. See also Mand. XII. 2. 4.

3. Ignatius.[1]

4. Polycarp.[1]

5. Syriac and Old Latin Versions. Muratorian Canon.

(See p. 292, note 1.)

6. Irenaeus.

B. IV. 16. 2. Et quia non per haec justificabatur homo, sed in signo data sunt populo, ostendit, quod ipse Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observatione sabbatorum, *credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est.* (James ii. 23. comp. Rom. iii. 23, 24; iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6.)

B. IV. 13. 4. (Abraham) amicus factus est Dei. (James ii. 23.)

B. V. 1. 1. Neque rursus nos aliter discere poteramus, nisi magistrum nostrum videntes et per auditum nostrum vocem ejus percipientes: uti imitatores quidem operum, factores autem

[4] Mand. XII is evidently based on James, as also Mand. IX and XI.

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echo: Ad Polyc. 4. 3, *μὴ ὑπερηφάνει* κ.τ.λ. (James ii. 2).

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echo: C. 5. 3 with James iii. 2.

sermonum ejus facti, communionem habeamus cum ipso; . . . Facti autem initium facturae.[1] (James i. 18, 22.)

7. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289 and note.)

Strom. III. 6. *p.* 533. *Λέγει δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ γραφή· "ὑπερηφάνοις ὁ Θεὸς ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν."*[2] (James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5; Prov. iii. 34.)

Ibid. IV. 26. *p.* 639. *Τοῦτο γὰρ "τὸ ἄνθος τοῦ χόρτου," καὶ τὸ "κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν," καὶ "σαρκικοὺς εἶναι" κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ὄντας.* (James i. 10; 1 Pet. i. 24; 2 Cor. x. 2.)

Ibid. VI. 18. *p.* 825. *"Ἐὰν μὴ πλεονάσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων" τῶν κατὰ ἀποχὴν κακῶν δικαιουμένων, σὺν τῷ μετὰ τῆς ἐν τούτοις τελειώσεως καὶ τῷ "τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπᾷν," καὶ εὐεργετεῖν δύνασθαι, οὐκ ἔσεσθε "βασιλικοί."* (Mat. v. 20; James ii. 8.)

8. Hippolytus.

Περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου. (Lagarde, p. 122.) *Ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνίλεώς ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος.* (James ii. 13.)

9. Tertullian.[1]

De orat. c. 8. Ceterum absit, ut Dominus tentare videatur, quasi aut ignoret fidem cujusque, aut dejicere sit gestiens. (James i. 13.)

Adv. Judaeos c. 2. Unde Abraham amicus Dei deputatus, si non de aequitate et justitia legis naturalis? (James ii. 23.)

Scorpiac. c. 12. Quis nunc medullam scripturarum magis

[1] Irenaeus. "Made the first fruits of Creation." (Anti-Nic. Library.)

[1] Clement. Compare as echoes: Paed. III. 2. p. 259 and elsewhere φίλος Θεοῦ James ii. 23 (but?); Strom. V. 14. p. 707 (also VII. 8. p. 862; and VII. 11. p. 872) "ἔστω, ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ." (See James v. 12).

[2] See before, page 293 (1 Clem. 30. 1 and note). The same words are similarly quoted also Strom. IV. 17. p. 611.

[1] Tertullian. The following passages are not to shew that Tertullian knew

nosset, quam ipsa Christi schola. . . . Cui potius figuram vocis suae declarasset, quam cui effigiem gloriae suae revelavit, Petro, Joanni, Jacobo, et postea Paulo?

10. Origen.[1]

Comment. in Joann. t. 19. Tom. IV. p. 306. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 569.) *Ἐὰν γὰρ λέγηται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ, νεκρά ἐστιν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ*[2] *Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν.*

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. IV. Tom. IV. p. 535. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 989.) Nec solus haec Paulus in suis literis scribit: audi et Jacobum fratrem Domini similia protestantem, cum dicit: "Qui voluerit amicus esse saeculi hujus, inimicus Dei constituetur." (James iv. 4.)

Ibid. p. 536. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 990.) Denique et Jacobus apostolus ita dicit: "Resistite diabolo, et fugiet a vobis: appropinquate Deo, et appropinquabit vobis." (James iv. 7, 8.)

Ibid. IX. p. 654. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1226.) Sicut et Jacobus apostolus dicit: "Omne datum bonum, et omne donum perfectum desursum est descendens a Patre luminum." (James i. 17.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 20. Tom. IV. p. 318. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 591.) *Οὐ συγχωρηθὲν ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν παραδεχομένων τό· Πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστιν.*

Selecta in Psalm. Ps. xxx. 6. Tom. II. p. 644. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 1300.) *Ὡς παρὰ Ἰακώβῳ, ὥσπερ δὲ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστι.*

Ibid. hom. IV. in Ps. xxxvi. p. 671. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 1351.) Justus autem si in aliquo offenderit, si in verbo (Apostolus enim

James: but that they (the nearest approaches) are not quotations. There are some other passages as De Exhort. Castitatis c. VII (Rom. ii. 13) which are still more remote.

[1] Origen is the first to quote or refer to James's Epistle by name. There are quotations in his own Greek which are perfectly explicit. The Latin of his works is regarded by some with suspicion. The translator had a way of inserting expletives and titles. The Greek is explicit as regards the Epistle of James: it is only in the Latin that we find James called the Lord's brother.

[2] Mill's note is: "*Immo vero ut in ipsius Origenis operibus, a Rufino Latinis factis, allegetur haec epistola tanquam* Jacobi Apostoli fratris Domini et Scriptura divina, *in commentariis tamen in Joannem Graecis, ab omni interpolatione liberis, dubiae apud quosdam auctoritatis citatur.*" Mill's G. T. Proleg. p. xxiv.

est qui dicit: "In multis enim offendimus omnes, et si quis in verbo non offendit, hic perfectus est vir.") (James iii. 2).

Select. in Exod. Tom. II. p. 124. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 288.) *Διὸ καὶ ἐλέχθη, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀπειραστός ἐστι κακῶν.*

11. Eusebius.

H. E. I. 12. *Καὶ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ πλείους τοῦ Σωτῆρος πεφηνέναι μαθητὰς εὕροις ἂν ἐπιτηρήσας, μάρτυρι χρώμενος τῷ Παύλῳ, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἔγερσιν ὤφθαι αὐτὸν φήσαντι πρῶτον μὲν Κηφᾷ, ἔπειτα τοῖς δώδεκα, καὶ μετὰ τούτους, ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ. Ὧν τινὰς μὲν ἔφασκε κεκοιμῆσθαι, τοὺς πλείους δ' ἔτι τῷ βίῳ, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν αὐτῷ ταῦτα συνετάττετο περιέναι* (or *περιμένειν*). *Ἔπειτα δ' ὤφθαι αὐτὸν Ἰακώβῳ φησίν· εἷς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀδελφῶν ἦν. Εἶθ' ὡς παρὰ τούτους, κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν δώδεκα, πλείστων ὅσων ὑπαρξάντων ἀποστόλων, οἷος καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Παῦλος ἦν, προστίθησι λέγων· "ἔπειτα ὤφθη τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσι."*

Ibid. II. 1. *Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφὸν* (*ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ὠνόμαστο παῖς· τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ ὁ Ἰωσὴφ, ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα ἡ παρθένος, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς, εὑρητο ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὡς ἡ ἱερὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων διδάσκει γραφή·*), *τοῦτον δὴ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, ὃν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπίκλην οἱ πάλαι δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκάλουν προτερήματα, πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον.*

Ibid. II. 23. *Τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται. Ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν. Ὅμως δ' ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις.*

Ibid. III. 3. (See before, p. 207.)

Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

Demonstr. Ev. III. 5. *Ἐπὶ τούτοις Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃν οἱ πάλαι τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα οἰκοῦντες ἐκάλουν δίκαιον διὰ τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς πλεονεκτήματα, ἐρωτηθεὶς πρὸς τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ διδασκάλων τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους, τίνα περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*

ἔχοι δόξαν, κἄπειτα ἀποκρινάμενος, ὅτι υἱὸς Θεοῦ εἴη, λίθοις καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτῶν βάλλεται.

De Eccles. Theol. III. (Migne, Vol. VI. p. 976.) Καθὸ λέλεκται ἐν ἑτέροις, Ἐξομολογεῖσθε ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας. (James v. 16.)

12. Athanasius.

Opp. Tom. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)

Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 16 &c.)

Ad Serap. Ep. 1. Tom. I. p. 539. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 592.) Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰάκωβος, παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα. (James i. 17.)

C. Arian. Or. 3. Tom. I. p. 483. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 452.) Καθὼς καὶ ὁ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀπόστολος διδάσκων ἔλεγε· βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς Λόγῳ ἀληθείας. (James i. 18.)

13. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. IV. (See before, p. 19.)

14. Epiphanius.

Haeres. Tom. I. (See before, p. 21.)

Ibid. I. t. 1. *h.* 31. *p.* 206. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἅγιος Ἰάκωβος λέγων περὶ τῆς τοιαύτης διδασκαλίας· ὅτι "Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνωθεν ἡ αὐτὴ σοφία κατερχομένη, ἀλλ' ἐπίγειος, ψυχικὴ, δαιμονιώδης. Ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἁγνή ἐστιν, ἔπειτα εἰρηνικὴ, εὐπειθὴς, ἀδιάκριτος, μεστὴ ἐλέους, καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν," καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. (James iii. 17.)

Ibid. III. t. 2. *h.* 77. *p.* 1021. Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ὅτι "Θρησκεία δὲ καθαρὰ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς, καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου." (James i. 27.)

15. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 2. Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia

uxore, ut autem mihi videtur, Mariae sororis matris Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius; post passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Ierosolymorum episcopus ordinatus, unam tantum scripsit Epistolam, quae de septem Catholicis est; quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur: licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem.

Ep. II. ad Paulin. (See before, p. 21.)

XXIX.

FIRST PETER.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XXVII.)

[1] This Epistle of Peter (which Jerome is singular in supposing to have been written in Hebrew) has sufficient testimony in its favour to show its acceptance in the early church. The words of 2 Peter iii. 1 may be considered the earliest of all. The silence of the Muratorian fragment does not outweigh the positive testimony in its favour of the Old Latin and of Irenaeus and Tertullian. And the Eastern Church gives its witness in the Syrian Canon. Critical opinion is found in Origen's words. Modern objections are therefore mainly founded on internal grounds. Semler led the way in doubting that Peter wrote it; and disputed c. V. 13, 14. Cludius (A.D. 1808) ascribed it to a disciple of Paul's. Eichhorn and De Wette followed in this view. Schwegler made an elaborate indictment against it as an apology for Paulinism addressed to the Petrine party, and intended to serve as a ground of mediation or compromise between the Petrine and Pauline sections of the divided church. He ascribed its date to the time of the persecution by Trajan. There is an able article by Weiss (Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 619) in reply to all who give it a later date than A.D. 54. Weiss seeks to prove that 1 Peter was written at an earlier period than Paul's circular letter (Ephesians). See also a full discussion in small compass by Brückner in De Wette's Kurzgef. Handb. d. N. T. (1865) p. 19. Hilgenfeld (Einl. p. 627) has a statement of characteristic force and clearness in which he refuses to accept the Epistle as merely a mediation between Petrine and Pauline Christians, but concludes (with the Tubingen School generally) that it was written from Rome during Trajan's persecution, and also that its author was a man who used Paul's Epistles, and James, and Hebrews. The principle on which all those modern objections go is, that the admitted similarity of this Epistle to some of Paul's and to James marks it out as a forgery. But the coincidences of thought only demonstrate the harmony of doctrine pervading the N. T. No imitator of Paul would have written an Epistle which passed by without explicit mention the doctrine of Justification by Faith; nor would a follower of James have dwelt so much on doctrine. That the Epistle blends doctrine and practice as no other does, with a sympathy founded on experience of the lights and shadows of a believer's life, is beyond dispute, and has been its attraction to penitent believers in all ages; but it is too deep and original and unique to be the work of any imitator or subordinate. Again: the ethical passages (such as c. iii. 8, comp. Rom. xii. 10; c. ii. 13, comp. Rom. xiii. 1), on which some found for proof of imitation, may really be traced to the words of the Master Himself. The student may compare c. i. 5 with Gal. iii. 23; c. ii. 6, 7 with Rom. ix. 23; c. ii. 11 with James iv. 1; c. ii. 13 with Rom. xiii. 1; c. iii. 9 with Rom. xii. 17; c. iii. 18 with Rom. vi. 9, 10; c. iii. 21 with Rom. vi. 4; c. iv. 1 with 2 Cor. v. 15 and Rom. vi. 7; c. iv. 10. 11 with Rom. xii. 6, 7; c. 5. 1 with Rom. viii. 18. As regards Hebrews, 1 Pet. i. 2 repeats Heb. xii. 24; but the other passages do not suffice to establish a connection. As regards James, 1 Pet. i. 1 may be compared (and partly contrasted) with James i. 1; c. i. 6, 7 with James i. 2-4; c. i. 23-25 with James 1, 18; c. iv. 8 with James v. 20. There are some coincidences of expression which seem to imply more than harmony of thought, and require us to suppose either that they were common phrases in Apostolic circles, or that one of the Apostles had seen the other's works. If the latter supposition he adopted, it is not easy to say which had the priority.

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

First Epistle.

C. 30. 2. (See before, under James.)

C. 38. 1. *Σωζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ὑποτασσέσθω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καθὼς καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ.* (1 Pet. v. 5; iv. 10; ii. 8.)

C. 49. 5. *Ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.* (1 Pet. iv. 8; comp. James v. 20.)

C. 57. 1. *Ὑμεῖς οὖν, οἱ τὴν καταβολὴν τῆς στάσεως ποιήσαντες, ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ παιδεύθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν, κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν. Μάθετε ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀποθέμενοι κ.τ.λ.* (1 Pet. v. 5; ii. 1.)

C. 59. 2. (Comp. c. 36. 2.) *Ἐκτενῆ τὴν δέησιν καὶ ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι ὅπως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν κατηριθμημένον τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διαφυλάξῃ ἄθραυστον ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἁπάντων διὰ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.* (1 Pet. ii. 9. See also Eph, i. 6.)

C. 61. 1. *Τοῖς τε ἄρχουσι καὶ ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, σὺ, δέσποτα, ἔδωκας τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς καὶ ἀνεκδιηγήτου κράτους σου, εἰς τὸ γινώσκοντας ἡμᾶς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ αὐτοῖς δεδομένην δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ὑποτάσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν ἐναντιουμένους τῷ θελήματί σου.* (1 Pet. ii. 13, 14; comp. Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 1 &c.)

[1] Barnabas. There is no passage in Barnabas which can be fairly claimed as quoting 1 Peter. But there are several passages which might be regarded as echoes if there were other proof that the writer had 1 Peter before him. Thus c. 5. 1 (αἷμα τοῦ ῥαντίσματος), comp. 1 Pet. i. 2; c. 16. 8, comp. 1 Pet. i. 3, 23; c. 16. 10 (πνευματικὸς ναός), 1 Pet. ii. 5; c. 19. 11 (οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις), 1 Pet. iv. 9.

[1] Clement. See Introduction. The passages in 1 Clem. quoting or suggesting 1 Peter may be given thus: C. 1. 1 (ξένης), 1 Pet. iv. 12; c. 2. 2 (ἀγαθοποιΐαν), 1 Pet. iv. 19; c. 2. 4 (ἀδελφότης), 1 Pet. ii. 17; c. 7. 4 (τίμιον), 1 Pet. i. 19; c. 16. 1 (ποίμνιον), 1 Pet. v. 2, 3 [also Luke xii. 32, Acts xx. 28]; c. 16. 17 (ὑπογραμμός), 1 Pet. ii. 21 [2 Macc. ii. 28]; c. 30. 1 (καταλαλιάς), 1 Pet. ii. 1; c. 36. 2 (τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς), 1 Pet. ii. 9; c. 38. 1 (see text); c. 40. 1 and 53. 1 (ἐγκεκυφότες), 1 Pet i. 12; c. 49. 1 (see text); c. 57. 1 (see text); c. 59. 2 (see text); c. 61. 1 (see text).

Second Epistle.

C. 16. 4. *Κρείσσων νηστεία προσευχῆς, ἐλεημοσύνη δὲ ἀμφοτέρων· ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.* (1 Pet. iv. 8.)

3. Hermas.

Vis. III. 11. 3. *Ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, μηκέτι ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα τοῦ ἀνανεῶσαι, οὐδὲν ἄλλο προσδοκῶσιν εἰ μὴ τὴν κοίμησιν αὐτῶν, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς μαλακισθέντες ἀπὸ τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων παρεδώκατε ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὰς ἀκηδίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐπερρίψατε ἑαυτῶν τὰς μερίμνας ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον· ἀλλὰ ἐθραύσθη ὑμῶν ἡ διάνοια, καὶ ἐπαλαιώθητε ταῖς λύπαις ὑμῶν.* (1 Pet. v. 7.)

Vis. IV. 2. 4. *Καλῶς ἐξέφυγες, φησὶν, ὅτι τὴν μέριμνάν σου ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἐπέρριψας.* (1 Pet. v. 7.)

Vis. IV. 3. 4. *Τὸ δὲ χρυσοῦν μέρος ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ ἐκφυγόντες τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον. Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ χρυσίον δοκιμάζεται διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ εὔχρηστον γίνεται, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς δοκιμάζεσθε οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῷ. Οἱ οὖν μείναντες καὶ πυρωθέντες ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καθαρισθήσεσθε. Ὥσπερ τὸ χρυσίον ἀποβάλλει τὴν σκωρίαν αὐτοῦ, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀποβαλεῖτε πᾶσαν λύπην καὶ στενοχωρίαν καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε καὶ χρήσιμοι ἔσεσθε εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ πύργου.* (1 Pet. i. 7.)

Mand. II. 1. *Λέγει μοι· Ἁπλότητα ἔχε καὶ ἄκακος γίνου καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς τὰ νήπια τὰ μὴ γινώσκοντα τὴν πονηρίαν τὴν ἀπολλύουσαν τὴν ζωὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* (1 Pet. ii. 2.)

Sim. IX. 16. 5.[1] *Ὅτι, φησὶν, οὗτοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κοιμηθέντες ἐν δυνάμει καὶ πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκήρυξαν καὶ τοῖς προκεκοιμημένοις, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ κηρύγματος. Κατέβησαν οὖν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν.* (1 Pet. iii. 19, 21.)

Sim. IX. 21. 3 (comp. Sim. IX. 14. 6). *Οἱ δίψυχοι, ὅταν*

[1] Hermas. This is quoted not as having any definite reference to 1 Pet. iii. 19 &c., but because it has been cited in connection with the controversies on the genuineness of the Epistle. It is strange that Dr Davidson, Int. to N. T. I. 427 should say that "the idea found in the 'shepherd' of Hermas" is that "he who preached to the dead was the Apostle Peter." Hermas *may* be quoting Peter. The connection with baptism, here as in 1 Peter iii. 19, 21, is not without significance. I cannot say with Gebhardt and Harnack "1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6 *respici non potest.*"

θλῖψιν ἀκούσωσι, διὰ τὴν δειλίαν αὐτῶν εἰδωλολατροῦσι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐπαισχύνονται τοῦ Κυρίου αὐτῶν. (1 Pet. iv. 16; Mark viii. 38.)

Sim. IX. 28. 5. *Βλέπετε οὖν ὑμεῖς οἱ ταῦτα βουλευόμενοι, μήποτε ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη διαμείνῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀποθανεῖσθε τῷ Θεῷ. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἠγήσατο ὁ Θεὸς ἵνα τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα βαστάζητε, καὶ πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν.* (1 Pet. iv. 13, 16.)

Sim. IX. 28. 6. *Οὐκοῦν μακαρίζετε ἑαυτούς· ἀλλὰ δοκεῖτε ἔργον μέγα πεποιηκέναι, ἐάν τις ὑμῶν διὰ τὸν Θεὸν πάθῃ, ζωὴν ὑμῖν ὁ Κύριος χαρίζεται, καὶ οὐ νοεῖτε· αἱ γὰρ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν κατεβάρησαν, καὶ εἰ μὴ πεπόνθατε ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος Κυρίου, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν τεθνήκειτε ἂν τῷ Θεῷ.* (1 Pet. iv. 14; comp. Mat. v. 11.)

Sim. IX. 29. 1. *. . . πιστεύσαντες τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν, ὡς νήπια βρέφη εἰσίν.* (1 Pet. ii. 2.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

5. Polycarp.[1]

Philipp. c. 1. 3. *Εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ· εἰς ἣν πολλοὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν.* (1 Pet. i. 8, 12.)

Ibid. c. 2. 1. *Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας ὑμῶν δουλεύσατε τῷ Θεῷ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀπολιπόντες τὴν κενὴν ματαιολογίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν πλάνην, πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν, καὶ θρόνον ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ.* (1 Pet. i. 13, 21.)

Ibid. c. 2. 2. *Ὃς ἔρχεται κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.* (1 Pet. iv. 5. Comp. Acts x. 42, and xvii. 31.)

Ibid. Μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ, ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας. (1 Pet. iii. 9.)

[1] Ignatius. In Ignatius may be compared as echoes: Magn. 13. 2 (ὑποτάγητε), 1 Pet. v. 5; ad Polyc. 4. 3 (δουλευέτωσαν κ.τ.λ.), 1 Pet. ii. 6.

[1] Polycarp. Compare as echoes Polycarp's Salutation with 1 Pet. i. 17; c. 8. 2 with 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16.

Ibid. c. 5. 3. *Καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται.* (1 Pet. ii. 11. Compare Gal. v. 17.)

Ibid. c. 7. 2. *Νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς.* (1 Pet. iv. 7.)

Ibid. c. 8. 1. *Ἀδιαλείπτως οὖν προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ ἀῤῥαβῶνι τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, πάντα ὑπέμεινεν. Μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν. Τοῦτον γὰρ ἡμῖν τὸν ὑπογραμμὸν ἔθηκε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦτο ἐπιστεύσαμεν.* (1 Pet. ii. 24, 22; 1 John iv. 9; also 1 Pet. ii. 20, 21; iv. 14, 16.)[2]

Ibid. c. 10. 1. In his ergo state et Domini exemplar sequimini, firmi in fide et immutabiles; fraternitatis amatores, diligentes invicem, in veritate sociati, mansuetudinem Domini alterutri praestolantes, nullum despicientes. (1 Pet. ii. 17.)

Ibid. c. 10. 2. *Omnes vobis invicem subjecti estote, conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus, ut ex bonis operibus vestris* et vos laudem accipiatis, et Dominus in vobis non blasphemetur. (1 Pet. ii. 12.)

Eus. H. E. IV. 14.[3] *Ὁ γέ τοι Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους αὐτοῦ γραφῇ φερομένῃ εἰς δεῦρο κέχρηταί τισι μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς.*

6. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. *Κέχρηται δ' αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.*

[2] Though this passage is almost entirely from 1 Peter, the order of the clauses is not as in Peter; and the use of ὑπέμεινεν and ὑπομονῆς is not a quotation, although evidently suggested by 1 Pet. ii. 20. To "suffer on account of Christ's name" is evidently a reminiscence of 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16 (less probably of Acts v. 41), but not a quotation of the words. Ὑπογραμμός is from 1 Pet. ii. 21, though not similarly placed in the context. The treatment of his authority by Polycarp here is valuable when we consider what may be regarded as a similar use of Mat. v. 3, &c. (See passage under Apostol. Fathers and the Synoptists.)

[3] There can be no doubt that Polycarp knew, quoted, and imitated 1 Peter. This quotation from Eusebius shows that this fact drew attention at an early date.

7. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 9. 2. [*Ἐλεῶν αὐτὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἀνεδέξατο.*][1] (1 Pet. ii. 24. Compare Isaiah liii.) *Αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τὸν ἅγιον ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων, τὸν ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων.* (1 Pet. iii. 18.)

8. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 1. *Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην σύλληψιν ἔξαρνοι γενόμενοι συνεκλείοντο καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ μετεῖχον τῶν δεινῶν· (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ὄφελός τι αὐτοῖς ἡ ἐξάρνησις ἐγίνετο·) ἀλλ᾽ οἱ μὲν ὁμολογοῦντες ὃ καὶ ἦσαν, συνεκλείοντο ὡς Χριστιανοί, μηδεμιᾶς ἄλλης αἰτίας αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένης· οὗτοι δὲ λοιπὸν ὡς ἀνδροφόνοι καὶ μιαροὶ κατείχοντο, διπλότερον παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς κολαζόμενοι. Ἐκείνους μὲν γὰρ ἐπεκούφιζεν ἡ χαρὰ τῆς μαρτυρίας, καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγάπη, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Πατρικόν, τούτους δὲ τὸ συνειδὸς μεγάλως ἐτιμωρεῖτο, ὥστε καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἅπασι κατὰ τὰς παρόδους διαδήλους τὰς ὄψεις αὐτῶν εἶναι. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἱλαροὶ προῆσαν, δόξης καὶ χάριτος πολλῆς ταῖς ὄψεσιν αὐτῶν συγκεκραμένης, ὥστε καὶ τὰ δεσμὰ κόσμιον εὐπρεπῆ περικεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς, ὡς νύμφῃ κεκοσμημένῃ ἐν κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς πεποικιλμένοις, τὴν εὐωδίαν* (2 Cor. ii. 15) *ὀδωδότες ἅμα τὴν Χριστοῦ, ὥστε ἐνίους δόξαι καὶ μύρῳ κοσμικῷ κεχρίσθαι αὐτούς· οἱ δὲ, κατηφεῖς καὶ ταπεινοὶ καὶ δυσειδεῖς, καὶ πάσης ἀσχημοσύνης ἀνάπλεοι, προσέτι δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὀνειδιζόμενοι ὡς ἀγεννεῖς καὶ ἄνανδροι, ἀνδροφόνων μὲν ἐγκλήματα ἔχοντες, ἀπολωλεκότες δὲ τὴν πάντιμον καὶ ἔνδοξον καὶ ζωοποιὸν προσηγορίαν.* (1 Pet. iv. 13-16.)

Ibid. V. 2. *Ἐταπείνουν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα, ὑφ᾽ ἧς ἱκανῶς νῦν εἰσὶν ὑψωμένοι.* (1 Pet. v. 6.)

9. The Muratorian Canon.

See p. 7 (not mentioned).

10. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

See pp. 1, 2 (contained in both).

[1] Diognetus. Of doubtful genuineness. See Otto's note. (3rd Ed. 1879.)

11. Irenaeus.

B. IV. 9. 2. Et Petrus ait in epistola sua: "Quem non videntes diligitis," inquit, "in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili." (1 Pet. i. 8.)

B. IV. 16. 5. Et propter hoc Petrus ait, "non velamentum malitiae habere nos libertatem," sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei. (1 Pet. ii. 16.)

Eus. H. E. V. 6. (See below, under 1 John.)

12. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Strom. IV. 7. p. 584. "*Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχομεν διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι,*" *φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος.* "*Τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβήθητε, μηδὲ ταραχθητε, Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. Ἑτοιμοι δὲ ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες τὴν καλὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ· κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας.*" (1 Pet. iii. 14-17.)

Paedag. I. 6. p. 124. *Διὰ τοῦτό φησι καὶ ὁ Πέτρος* "*ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνον καὶ καταλαλιὰν, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, τὸ λογικὸν γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος.*" (1 Pet. ii. 1-3.)

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before: The Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)

13. Tertullian.[1]

De Virg. Veland. c. 17. Haec cum bona pace legentibus, utilitatem consuetudini praeponentibus, *pax* et *gratia* a Domino

[1] See also Strom. III. 9. p. 544 (ὁ Παυμάσιος Πέτρος); and III. 18. p. 562 (ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ); and IV. 7. p. 585; and IV. 20. p. 622; and there are about twenty more passages, some with the name of Peter and some without.

[1] Tertullian. Credner (Gesch. des N. T. Kan. § 80) admits that Tertullian, quoted from 1 Peter in *Scorp.* c. 12, c. 14, and *Adv. Jud.* c. 10, but throws doubt on his respect for the Epistle, seeing that he does not quote it in his *De Resurrectione.* Volkmar (ibid. § 182) more broadly denies the authenticity of the works of Tertullian from which the quotations are taken; and concludes that if he ever

nostro Jesu *redundet,* cum Septimio Tertulliano cujus hoc opusculum est. (1 Pet. i. 2.)

De Oratione c. 20. De modestia quidem cultus et ornatus aperta praescriptio est etiam Petri, cohibentis eodem ore, quia eodem et spiritu, quo Paulus, et vestium gloriam et auri superbiam et crinium lenonem (*al.* lenoniam) operositatem. (1 Pet. iii. 3.)

Adv. Praxean. c. 27. Sermo autem Deus, et *Sermo Domini manet in aevum.* (1 Pet. i. 25; comp. Ps. cxix. 89; Is. xl. 8; John i. 1.)

Adv. Jud. c. 10. Christus, qui dolum de ore suo locutus non est. (1 Pet. ii. 22; comp. Is. liii. 9.)

Scorpiace, c. 12. Petrus quidem ad Ponticos, "Quanta enim," inquit, "gloria, si non ut delinquentes puniamini sustinetis? Haec enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis etc." (1 Pet. ii. 20, 21.)

Ibid. c. 14. Condixerat scilicet Petrus regem quidem honorandum.[2] (1 Pet. ii. 13.)

14. Origen.

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 8.)

Hom. in Genes. (See before, p. 51.)

Hom. in libr. Jesu Nave. (See before, p. 52.)

Comment. in Mat. t. 15. Tom. III. p. 692. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1333.) *Παραλαβὼν δὲ εἰς τοῦτο ἀπό τε τῆς πρώτης Ἐπιστολῆς,*[1] *καὶ τῆς Παύλου πρὸς Κορινθίους προτέρας ῥητὰ, προαχθήσῃ ὡς*

knew 1 Peter it was at the end of his life, after A.D. 207, and in a Greek form. Regarding the controversy on the genuineness of Tertullian's *Adv. Jud.* and *Scorpiace*, see Semler's edition of Tertullian, Vol. V. p. 212; Neander's Antignosticus, p. 530 (Bohn's Transl.); Kaye's Tertullian, Pref. to second edition; and Rönsch, Das N. T. Tertullians, p. 556. To pronounce all those treatises (or the parts of them, as Adv. Jud. c. 10 or De Orat. c. 20) spurious is a violent proceeding, which the facts do not justify. Retaining them, however, we have evidence that Tertullian knew and used 1 Peter. That on other occasions he omitted it, where we should have expected quotations, shows that he did not always accept it without reserve. The passage from De Orat. c. 20 is conclusive, and is too well supported not to be genuine.

[2] Compare as possible echoes or allusions: Fug. c. 12, *pretiosissimo sanguine*, &c. (1 Pet. i. 18, 19); Corona, c. 15, *incorruptus*, &c. (1 Pet. i. 4); Adv. Marc. 5. 12, *elatos aemulantem* (1 Pet. v. 5).

[1] Origen. Lardner (amending Huet) notes that the reading was προῦ for Πέτρου, not πρώτης, so that there is not implied reference to a second Epistle. See p. 8 for double reference. Origen often quotes 1 Peter. See Lardner I. p. 539; but Lardner—inasmuch as there is no Greek quotation of "the First Epistle" as such,—supposes that in the Latin (as in next extract) we owe the form of re-

ὑγιῶς εἰρημένων τῷ λόγῳ· λέγει γὰρ ὁ μὲν Πέτρος· Εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες, δηλονότι Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς, ἕως τοῦ· Εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι. (1 Pet. i. 8-10.)

De Princip. L. II. c. 5, 3. Tom. I. p. 88. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 206.) Non legunt quid scriptum sit de spe illorum qui in diluvio perempti sunt, de qua spe Petrus ipse in prima Epistola[1] sua ita ait: "Quia Christus mortuus quidem est carne, vivificatus autem spiritu: in quo pergens praedicavit his spiritibus qui in carcere tenebantur, qui increduli fuerant aliquando cum exspectarent Dei patientiam in diebus Noe cum fabricaretur arca, in qua pauci, id est octo animae salvae factae sunt per aquam, quod et vos simili forma nunc baptisma salvos facit." (1 Pet. iii. 18, &c.)

Selecta in Psalm. In Ps. iii. c. 3, 7. Tom. II. p. 553. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 1128.) Κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐπιστολῇ παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ· "ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν ἀπειθήσασί ποτε, ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοντέστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 6. 18. Tom. IV. p. 135. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 260.) Καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ Πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐπιστολῇ· "Θανατωθεὶς γάρ," φησι, "σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς κ.τ.λ." (1 Pet. iii. 18-20.)

15. Cyprian.

De bono patient. Item Petrus, super quem Ecclesia, Domini dignatione fundata est, in Epistola sua ponit et dicit: "Christus passus est pro nobis, relinquens nobis exemplum ut sequamini vestigia ejus, qui peccatum non fecit, nec dolus inventus est in ore ejus; qui cum malediceretur, non maledicebat; cum pateretur, non comminabatur. Tradebat autem se judicanti se injuste." (1 Pet. ii. 21-23.)

Epist. 58 (al. 56). *Ad Thibarit.* Nec quisquam miretur, persecutionibus nos assiduis fatigari, et pressuris angentibus frequenter

ference to the translator. Lardner however seems to allow too little weight to the passage preserved by Eusebius, where there can be no doubt of the reference to two Epistles, one of them disputed.

urgeri: quando haec futura in novissimis temporibus Dominus ante praedixerit, et militiam nostram magisterio et hortamento sui sermonis instruxerit: Petrus quoque Apostolus ejus docuerit, ideo persecutiones fieri, ut probemur, et ut dilectioni Dei, justorum praecedentium exemplo, nos etiam morte et passionibus copulemur: posuit enim in Epistola sua dicens: "Carissimi, nolite mirari ardorem accidentem vobis, qui ad tentationem vestram fit, nec excidatis, tanquam novum vobis contingat, sed quotienscunque communicatis Christi passionibus, per omnia gaudete, ut et in revelatione facta claritatis ejus gaudentes exultetis. Si improperatur vobis in nomine Christi, beati estis, qui majestatis et virtutis Domini nomen in vobis requiescit. Quod quidem secundum illos blasphematur, secundum nos autem honoratur." (1 Pet. iv. 12-14.)

16. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 4. *Καὶ ἐκ τῶν Πέτρου δὲ λέξεων, ἐν ὁπόσαις καὶ οὗτος ἐπαρχίαις τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς τὸν Χριστὸν εὐαγγελιζόμενος, τὸν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρεδίδου λόγον, σαφὲς ἂν εἴη, ἀφ' ἧς εἰρήκαμεν ὁμολογουμένης αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῆς, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς ἐξ Ἑβραίων οἴσιν ἐν διασπορᾷ Πόντου καὶ Γαλατίας Καππαδοκίας τε καὶ Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας γράφει.*

Ibid. III. 3. (See before, Epistles as a whole, p. 207.)

Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

17. Athanasius.

Epist. I. ad Serap. p. 522. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 544.) *Καὶ Πέτρος ἔγραψε· Κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν· περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηρεύνησαν προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, ἐρευνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλοῦτο τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.* (1 Pet. i. 10, 11.)

Contra Apollinarium L. II. p. 755. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 1144.) *Καὶ πῶς, εἰ σαρκικὴ ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ὑμᾶς, οὐ συνθνήσκει τῷ σώματι, καὶ συμφθείρεται; Πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος, τὰς ἐν ᾅδῃ κατ-*

ἐχομένας ψυχὰς, πνεύματα ὀνομάσας, ἔλεγεν· Ἐπορεύθη τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ κατακεκλεισμένοις πνεύμασι εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)

Opp. Tom. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)
Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

18. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. 4. (See before, p. 19.)

19. Epiphanius.

Haeres III. t. 1. *h.* 76. *p.* 941. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 560.) (See before, "Canon of Epiphanius," p. 21.)

20. Jerome.

Epist. II. ad Paulinum. (See before, p. 21.)
Proleg. 7. *epist. canonic.* (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 290.)
De Vir. Ill. c. 1. Simon Petrus . . . scripsit duas epistolas, quae Catholicae nominantur: quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam.
Epist. 120. *ad Hedibiam,* Quaest. XI. Quumque (sc. Paulus) haberet scientiam sanctarum Scripturarum et sermonis diversarumque linguarum gratiam possideret; unde ipse gloriatur in Domino, et dicit: *Gratias ago Deo, quod omnium vestrum linguis magis loquor,* divinorum sensuum majestatem digno non poterat Graeci eloquii explicare sermone. Habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus Evangelium, Petro narrante et illo scribente, compositum est. Denique et duae Epistolae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepant, structuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum, diversis eum usum interpretibus.

XXX.

SECOND PETER.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I-III. XI. XXVII.)

[1] The earliest quotation from this Epistle is probably that in 2 Clement. Justin's apparent references are worthy of notice, and so also are those of Irenaeus. Clement of Alexandria commented on the Epistle. Origen's testimony may be ambiguous, as it is said to be, but it is scarcely possible that even Rufinus, when paraphrasing his original, would invent so many distinct passages as are found in his Latin version of Origen. See text, p. 52, and references in this chapter. It appears to have been an admitted part of Scripture in Origen's time, although what Eus. H. E. VI. 25 ascribes to him is not less likely to be correct: Ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. This is not a statement of opinion, but the record of a matter of fact. Eusebius mentions the wide circulation of the Epistle, and the doubts of its canonicity, without meeting the difficulties involved; but Jerome argues on the subject. From his day to ours the Epistle has been generally received, but (at least from the Reformation) with some doubts on the part of many. Reuss and Hilgenfeld reject it. See Brückner's Commentary in De Wette's Exeget. Handb.

The similarity of 2 Peter to Jude has occasioned suspicion of the genuineness of both, and also much controversy as to the relative priority of the two Epistles. The passages Jude 3-16 and 2 Pet. ii. 1-19 are too like to admit of denial that the one writer had the other in view. On the whole, it seems that there is a directness and explicitness about Jude which make it likely that he was first: but although the same illustrations are in both Epistles, the object in view is not the same. The treatment of the illustrations is accordingly different and independent. There is no imitation or servile copying. Compare the different use of ὑπέρογκα with and without ματαιότητος, Jude 6 and 2 Pet. ii. 18; and see συνευωχούμενοι, Jude 12 and 2 Pet. ii. 13. Both of the Epistles must have been written at an early date in the history of the Church. See how Jude 17, 18, uses the prediction also found in 2 Pet. iii. 3. The immediate Parousia is implied in both, though Jude does not mention it. This makes for the genuineness of both letters. The disappointment of that expectation was such as to have prevented a forger (say in the second century) from recalling it; and the expression of the strong hope of the Church is characteristic of the apostolic age. In 1 Clem. c. 23 and 2 Clem. c. 11 we have the expectations of a later time dealt with; and a singular quotation (called γραφή and προφητικὸς λόγος) is applied in both cases. But the position of the writers of 2 Peter and Jude is quite different from that of Clement and of the preacher of the Homily called "2 Clement." When critics attempt to fix a date after the Fall of Jerusalem for our Epistles they do not succeed.

If Peter wrote both Epistles, the time which had passed in the interval had made a change in the circumstances of the persons addressed. In the first he speaks of external assaults, in the second the danger is from within. It is not yet from Gnostic or theosophic speculations: it is practical libertinism, lawlessness. The first Epistle is altogether more Jewish than the second. The Churches addressed have increased more in Gentile than in Jewish adherents since the first Epistle, so exclusively Jewish in its tone, was penned; and the change thus brought about goes far to account for the difference in the relation to the Old Testament in the two Epistles. It is a difference in degree. The Old Testament

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.[1]

Second Epistle.

C. 16. 3. *Γινώσκετε δὲ ὅτι ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος, καὶ τακήσονταί τινες τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλιβος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος· καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* (Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 9; iii. 7.)

3. Hermas.[1]

Vis. III. 7. 1. *Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ πεπιστευκότες μὲν, ἀπό τε τῆς διψυχίας αὐτῶν ἀφίουσιν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀληθινήν.* (2 Pet. ii. 15.)

Vis. IV. 3. 4. *Τὸ δὲ χρυσοῦν μέρος ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ ἐκφυγόντες τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον.* (2 Pet. ii. 20.)

is still appealed to; but the whole tone and substance are less peculiarly Jewish. We may also note that there are in this second Epistle several points of resemblance to the Pastoral Epistles of Paul. See the use of εὐσέβεια. Paul seems to have been still alive (iii. 15). The chief difficulty in holding the Petrine authorship of both Epistles lies in the apparently different persons addressed, while yet the second claims to be written to the same persons (iii. 1). But on the whole we may hold that the growth of the Church accounts for the degree of difference: the "strangers of the Diaspora" in the first letter are the "equally favoured Christians" of the second; and the object of both Epistles is that grace and peace may be multiplied (1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2). But in the second there is the necessity of seeking that increase of grace and peace by promoting true knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of the Personal God and the Saviour. (See Weiss on this Epistle in Stud. u. Krit. for 1866, p. 255 &c.)

[1] Barnabas. In Barnabas, c. 2, 3 an echo of 2 Pet. i. 6 may be found; and in c. 15, 4 (ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη) a ground of comparison with 2 Pet. iii. 8. The application of the words is quite different in this last case. Comp. Ps. xc. 4. See below in passages from Justin and Irenaeus.

[1] Clement. In Clement there are several passages which have been cited as references to 2 Peter. But they are rather parallels than citations. Thus c. 7. 1 (2 Pet. i. 12-iii. 9); c. 7. 5 (2 Pet. ii. 5); c. 9. 2 (2 Pet. i. 17); c. 11. 1 (2 Pet. ii. 6, 7, 9); c. 23. 1 (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4).

[1] Hermas. Comp. on the greed of false teachers Sim. IX. 19. 3 with 2 Pet. ii. 3 and Jude 16.

[1] Compare as echoes: Ignatius, Eph. 14. 1. πίστιν καὶ ἀγάπην ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ τέλος (2 Pet. i. 5-7). Polyc. Phil. c. 3. 2 (2 Pet. iii. 15).

4. Ignatius and Polycarp.[1]

5. Justin Martyr.[1]

Dial. c. 81. *p.* 308 *A.* Συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι Ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγειν.[2] (2 Pet. iii. 8; comp. Ps. xc. 4.)

Dial. c. 82. *p.* 308 *C.* Ὅνπερ δὲ τρόπον καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐπὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν γενομένων ἁγίων προφητῶν ἦσαν, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν νῦν πολλοί εἰσι καὶ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οὓς φυλάσσεσθαι προεῖπεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος. (2 Pet. ii. 1 and i. 21.)

6. Muratorian Canon, Syriac[1] and Old Latin Versions.

See before, pp. 1 and 6.

7. Melito.[1] A.D. 160 (?).

Oration to Antoninus Caesar. (Cureton's Spicilegium Syriacum, p. 51.) So also it will be at the last time; there shall be a flood of fire, and the earth shall be burnt up together with its mountains, and men shall be burnt up together with the idols which they have made, and with the graven images which they have worshipped; and the sea together with its isles shall be burnt; and the just shall be delivered from the fury, like their fellows in the ark from the waters of the deluge. (2 Pet. iii. 10, 12.)

[1] Justin. The passages from Justin are peculiar. The first (see before, note on Barnabas) may be from the LXX, Ps. lxxxix, but it is used more nearly in the sense of 2 Peter by Justin than by Barnabas. Justin uses the words in connection with the warning to Adam, that "In the day he ate of the tree," &c. The second recalls Peter to some minds by closely associating the Old and New Testament's experiences of false prophets.

[2] See before, note on Barnabas.

[1] The Syriac Canon did not include 2 Peter. Ephrem Syrus (A.D. 370) accepted seven Catholic Epistles. But this is regarded as a Greek rather than a Syrian testimony. See his contemporary Gregory's testimony below, in the text.

[1] Melito's Oration to Antoninus Cæsar is found in one of the Syriac MSS brought from the Nitrian Desert by Archdeacon Tattam in 1843. It was edited by Cureton, printed in 1847, and published in 1855. It does not contain the passage quoted by Eusebius (H. E. IV. 26), and Cureton supposes that Melito (like Justin Martyr) twice addressed the Emperor. The Paschal Chronicle seems to favour this supposition. See Cureton's Preface, p. viii.

8. Irenaeus.

B. IV. 36. 4. Et temporibus Noe diluvium inducens, uti exstingueret pessimum genus eorum qui tunc erant homines, qui jam fructificare Deo non poterant, quum angeli transgressores commixti fuissent eis; et ut peccata eorum compesceret, servaret vero arcae typum Adae plasmationem, et temporibus Lot qui pluit super Sodomam et Gomorrham ignem et sulphur de coelo, exemplum justi judicii Dei, ut cognoscerent omnes, quoniam omnis arbor quae non facit fructum bonum, excidetur et in ignem mittetur: et in universali judicio tolerabilius Sodomis utens, quam his qui viderunt ejus virtutes quas faciebat, et non crediderunt in eum, neque receperunt ejus doctrinam. (2 Pet. ii. 4-7.)

B. V. 23. 2. Quidam autem rursus in millesimum annum revocant mortem Adae: quoniam enim "dies Domini, sicut mille anni," non superposuit autem mille annos, sed intra eos mortuus est, transgressionis adimplens sententiam. (2 Pet. iii. 8.)

B. V. 28. 3. *Ὅσαις . . . ἡμέραις ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος, τοσαύταις χιλιοντάσι συντελεῖται. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ἡ γραφή· καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν. Καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ς′ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐποίησε, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα τῇ ζ′ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτο δ' ἔστι τῶν προγεγονότων διήγησις, καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων προφητεία. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς ᾳ ἔτη· ἐν ἓξ οὖν ἡμέραις συντετέλεσται τὰ γεγονότα· φανερὸν οὖν, ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια αὐτῶν τὸ ς′ ἔτος ἐστίν.* (2 Pet. iii. 8.)

9. Theophilus.

Ad Autolyc. II. 9. *p.* 87. *Οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνευματοφόροι Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες καὶ σοφισθέντες, ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι καὶ ὅσιοι καὶ δίκαιοι.*[1] (2 Pet. i. 21.)

Ibid. II. 13. *p.* 92. *Ἡ διάταξις οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ, ἐφώτισεν τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν.* (2 Pet. i. 19.)

[1] Theophilus. Comp. III. 12. p. 125, τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἐνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι, and Justin Dial. c. 7. p. 224 D for a definition of prophets.

10. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)
Cassiodor. div. lect. c. 8. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)

11. Origen.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 8.)

Comment. in Mat. t. 15. *Tom. III. p.* 692. (See above, p. 308.)

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. B. VIII. Tom. IV. p. 631. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1179.) Et Petrus in Epistola sua dicit: "Gratia vobis et pax multiplicetur in recognitione Dei:" et iterum alibi: "Ut boni dispensatores multiplicis gratiae Dei." (2 Pet. i. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 10.)

In Levit. homil. 4. Tom. II. p. 200. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 437.) Audi et Joannem, quomodo uno eodemque spiritu proloquatur. "Et societatem," inquit, "habemus cum Patre, et cum Filio ejus Jesu Christo." Et iterum Petrus dicit: "Consortes," inquit, "facti estis divinae naturae," quod est socii. (2 Pet. i. 4.)

In Numer. homil. 13. Tom. II. p. 321. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 676.) Non quod digna (sc. asina) esset videre angelum, sicut nec loqui digna erat, sed ut confutaretur Balaam: et ut ait quodam in loco Scriptura: "Mutum animal humana voce respondens, arguit prophetae dementiam." (2 Pet. ii. 16.)

In Exod. homil. 12. Tom. II. p. 174. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 386.) Scio enim scriptum esse, quia unusquisque a quo vincitur, huic et servus addicitur, etc. (2 Pet. ii. 19.)

[1] Clem. Alex. In this passage Eusebius says that Clement wrote short expositions of all the Scripture—including the Antilegomena—not passing by Jude and the other Catholic Epistles. This is distinct testimony and trustworthy. Cassiodorus (A.D. 514) in his De Instit. Divin. says the same thing: "*Ferunt itaque scripturas divinas Veteris Novique Testamenti ab ipso principio usque ad finem Graeco sermone declarasse Clementem Alexandrinum.*" In another passage, c. 8, he limits this by saying: "*In Epistolis autem canonicis, Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromateus dicitur, id est in epistola S. Petri prima et secunda, et Jacobi quaedam Attico sermone declaravit.*" But this uncertain statement of a writer two hundred years after Eusebius could not (even if consistent with itself) overturn what Eusebius said. We must indeed remember that we do not know the exact amount of deference Clement paid to 2 Peter; but by making an exposition of it he showed that he counted it in some sense Scripture. See Introd. "Clement of Alexandria."

[1] Origen. On Origen's references compare on 1 Peter, note 1. page 309.

Adamantii dial. de recta fide, sect. 1. Tom. I. p. 821. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 1760.) *Πείσει δέ σε καὶ ὁ ἔξωθεν λόγος· ὅτι ἕκαστος ᾧ ἥττηται, τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται.* (2 Pet. ii. 19.)

Ibid. sect. 2. p. 828. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 1778.) *Πῇ δὲ ὑπὸ Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου γεγραμμένον· κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν, φησὶν, τὴν δεδομένην τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου Παύλῳ.* (2 Pet. iii. 15.)

In libr. Jesu Nave homil. 8. Tom. II. p. 412. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 857.) Petrus etiam duabus Epistolarum suarum personat tubis.

Comment. in Joann. (See above, 1 Pet. p. 309.)

12. Firmilian.

Ep. ad Cyprian. (Ep. Cyprian. 75.) Adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos Apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint; qui in Epistolis suis haereticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt.[1]

13. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 3. (See before, p. 207.)

Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

14. Athanasius.

De S. Trinit. dialog. 1. Tom. II. p. 411. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1125.) *Καὶ ἐν ταῖς καθολικαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γέγραπται· Δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα ἡμῖν καὶ τίμια ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.* (2 Pet. i. 4.)

Contra Arianos orat. I. Tom. I. p. 331. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 45.) *Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ὃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Πέτρος· ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.* (2 Pet. i. 4.)

Opp. t. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)

Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

15. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. 4. (See before, p. 19.)

[1] Firmilian's reference must be to 2 Peter, as in it alone are the allusions to heretics.

16. Gregory of Nazianzum.

Carm. 33. *vers.* 31.[1] *Καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν τινὲς μὲν ἑπτά φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας χρῆναι δέχεσθαι.*

17. Epiphanius.

Haeres. II. t. 2. *h.* 66. *p.* 678. (Migne II. 129.) *Ὡς φησιν Πέτρος ἐν τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ· προσέχοντες τῷ προφητικῷ λόγῳ, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ, καὶ ἡμέρα καταγάσῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.* (2 Pet. i. 19.)

Haeres. III. t. 1. *h.* 76. *p.* 941. (Migne II. 560.) (See before, p. 21.)

18. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 1. (See before, 1 Pet. p. 311.)

Epist. 120. *c.* 11. (See before, 1 Pet. p. 311.)

Ep. II. ad Paulin. (See before, p. 21.)

Proleg. 7. *Epist. Canon.* (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 290.)

[1] Gregory. This is a formal catalogue designed to guide his friend. See before, page 314, on Syriac Canon and Ephrem as regards 2 Peter.

XXXI.

FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.[1]

1. Barnabas.

C. 5. 10. (11). *Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκὶ, πῶς ἂν ἐσώθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι βλέποντες αὐτόν.* . . . (See 1 John iv. 2.)

[1] The First Epistle of John stands or falls with the Fourth Gospel, which it resembles so closely. Scaliger said in an offhand way: *Tres Epistolae Joannis non sunt Apostoli Joannis.* J. E. Lange (1797) was the first to formulate a doubt of the authenticity of the Epistle while, curiously enough, maintaining that the Gospel and the Apocalypse are by John. He alleged that it is not genuine, because there is nothing personal or individual or local about it; because it is suspiciously like the work of an imitator of the author of the Gospel; and because it is a great falling-off from the power of the Gospel (see Lücke, III. p. 10). He farther alleged that if the last is said to be due to John's writing it in extreme old age, there is a difficulty raised at once, because in that case it must have been written after the Fall of Jerusalem, while ii. 18 is evidently written before that catastrophe. Bretschneider held that the three Epistles go together, that they are the work of John the Presbyter; and that the doctrine of the Logos and the anti-doketic teaching are of the second century. Bleek denies that the Epistle is anti-doketic; and supposes it to be intended to arrest apostacy which arose from no very definite principles. The history of the fortunes of the Epistle is told in full detail by Lücke in his 'Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes,' Vol. III. In answer to the arguments quoted above it may suffice to say here that the unprejudiced reader is not likely to agree with Lange's objections; and that, since Bretschneider wrote, the most recent enquiries have brought into prominence the existence of the Logos-doctrine in Justin, and so confirmed the statement of Irenaeus (B. III. 11. 1) that Cerinthus, a Dokete, was a contemporary of the Apostle John. Tertullian (De carne Christi c. 24) and Dion. Alex. (Eus. H. E. VII. 25) believed that Doketae were in view.

The Greek church regarded the Epistle as written in Ephesus, and designed to meet the wants of the churches around. It was probably written after the Gospel: its opening words at all events naturally suggest that order. There is indeed everything to make one suppose that it was written as an outline of Christian doctrine founded on, or flowing from, the Gospel, and therefore not only subsequent to the Gospel but a companion document. There has been much conjecture as to Augustine's statement that it was written *ad Parthos.* And the conjectures do not clear up the mystery. It seems to have been a slip of Augustine's or of his amanuensis. Clem. Alex. says 2 John was written πρὸς παρθένους; and this may have in some way originated the mistake.

But apart from all such questions, the external evidence suffices to show that this Epistle had an early place in the undoubting acceptance of the Church. Polycarp, and Papias and the Muratorian Fragment, and the Peshito and Old Latin Versions, and Irenaeus, and Clement, and Origen, make a chain which it is not possible to break. The Alogi probably rejected it (though the words of Epiphanius Haer. LI. 3 do not expressly say so), and Marcion certainly did reject it. But so far as the testimony of antiquity goes, this Epistle is beyond dispute the work of the Evangelist, John the Apostle.

2. Clement of Rome.

First Epistle.[1]

Second Epistle.[2]

3. Hermas.[1]

4. Ignatius.[1]

Eph. c. 11. 1. Ἔσχατοι καιροί· λοιπὸν αἰσχυνθῶμεν, φοβηθῶμεν τὴν μακροθυμίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἡμῖν εἰς κρῖμα γένηται. Ἢ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν ὀργὴν φοβηθῶμεν, ἢ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν χάριν ἀγαπήσωμεν· ἓν τῶν δύο· μόνον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εὑρεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν. (Comp. 1 John ii. 18; v. 20.)

5. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 3. 3. Ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακρὰν ἐστι πάσης ἁμαρτίας.[1] (1 John passim.)

Ibid. c. 7. 1. Πᾶς γὰρ, ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, Ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. Καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ λέγῃ μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ. (1 John iv. 3; also 2 John 7.)

[1] Clement. There is no citation in 1 Clement: the following may be echoes: C. 31. 2. Ἀβραάμ . . . ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας (1 John i. 6; John iii. 21). C. 49. 1. ποιησάτω τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραγγέλματα (1 John v. 1-3; John xiv. 15).

[2] The only passage in 2 Clement which may seem to be an echo is one, c. 6. 9, containing the word παράκλητος, but he is connected with just and holy works; not as in 1 John ii. 1.

[1] Hermas. Echo: Mand. XII. 4. 3, comp. 1 John iii. 6. 9.

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echo: Magnes. 6. 1. ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρί (1 John i. 2). It is not at all made out that John connected the coming of Christ with the Destruction of Jerusalem. The spiritual Antichrist is always in John's mind. And the arguments founded on 1 John ii. 18 as to the date of the Epistle (see note 1 on the Epistle) being insecure, and "the last time" having a mainly spiritual reference in the Epistle of John, this reference in Ignatius (which seems to contemplate a coming visible judgement) cannot be connected with John.

[1] Polycarp. The previous words remind the reader of the Synoptists when they speak of the man who loves Christ and his neighbour as one who πεπλήρωκεν ἐντολὴν δικαιοσύνης. (Mat. xxii. 40.)

Ibid. c. 8. 1. *Δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, πάντα ὑπ-έμεινεν.* (1 John iv. 9.)

6. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. *Κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.*

7. Justin Martyr.[1]

Apol. I. c. 32. *p.* 74 *B. Οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰσιν ἄνθρωποι, ἐν οἷς οἰκεῖ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος.* (Compare 1 John iii. 9; ii. 14).

8. Letter to Diognetus.

C. 10. 2. (Justini Opp. p. 500 D.) *Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώ-πους ἠγάπησε . . . πρὸς οὓς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μο-νογενῆ, οἷς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγείλατο, καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν. Ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ, τίνος οἴει πληρωθήσεσθαι χαρᾶς; Ἢ πῶς ἀγαπήσεις τὸν οὕτως προαγαπήσαντά σε; Ἀγαπήσας δὲ μιμητὴς ἔσῃ αὐτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητος.* (1 John iv. 9 &c.)

9. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.

Eus. H. E. V. 1. *Ὃ διὰ τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς ἀγάπης ἐν-εδείξατο, εὐδοκήσας ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπολογίας καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεῖναι ψυχήν.* (1 John iii. 16; comp. John xv. 13.)

10. Muratorian Canon.

Si Joannes tam constanter singula etiam in Epistulis suis proferat dicens in semetipso: *Quae vidimus* &c. (1 John i. 1). . . . Epistula sane Judae et superscripti Joannis duas in Catholica habentur.

(For context see pp. 6, 7 and notes.)

[1] Justin. The passage in the text does not seem at all secure. There is another passage which may be compared: Dial. c. 123. p. 353 B., with 1 John iii. 1-3.

11. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

See pp. 1 and 2. (Both contain 1 John.)

12. Irenaeus.

B. III. 16. 5. Propter quod et in epistola sua sic testificatus est nobis (Joannes): "Filioli, novissima hora est, et quemadmodum audistis quoniam Antichristus venit, nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt; unde cognoscimus quoniam novissima hora est. Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis: si enim fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum; sed ut manifestarentur quoniam non sunt ex nobis. Cognoscite ergo quoniam omne mendacium extraneum est, et non est de veritate. Quis est mendax, nisi qui negat quoniam Jesus non est Christus? hic est Antichristus." (1 John ii. 18, &c.)

B. III. 16. 8. Et rursus in epistola ait: "Multi pseudoprophetae exierunt de saeculo. In hoc cognoscite Spiritum Dei. Omnis spiritus qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo est. Et omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, non est ex Deo, sed de Antichristo est." (1 John iv. 1, 2, 3.)

Ibid. *Διὸ πάλιν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησι· Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται.* (1 John v. 1.)

Eus. H. E. V. 8. *Μέμνηται δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰωάννου πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς, μαρτύρια ἐξ αὐτῆς πλεῖστα εἰσφέρων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῆς Πέτρου προτέρας.*

13. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)

Cassiodor. div. lect. c. 8. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289, note 1.)

Paedag. III. c. 11. 82. *p.* 301. *"Αὕτη δὲ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ," φησὶν Ἰωάννης, "ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς τηρήσωμεν," οὐχ ἵνα σαίνωμεν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῷ στόματι· "καὶ αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν."* (1 John v. 3.)

Strom. II. c. 15. 66. *p.* 464.[2] *Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐν*

[1] Clement. In Clement's citations (whether as from John by name or otherwise) there is no trace of doubt as to the authorship and authority of the Epistle.

[2] It appears from this that Clement knew two Epistles. One of the smaller

τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκδιδάσκων ἐν τούτοις· "Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, αἰτήσει καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν·" τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι "μὴ πρὸς θάνατον" εἶπεν. "ἔστι γὰρ ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον· οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ τις," κ.τ.λ. (1 John v. 16.)

14. Tertullian.

Scorpiac. c. 12. Joannes vero, ut etiam pro fratribus nostris animas ponamus, hortatur, negans timorem esse in dilectione, &c. (1 John iii. 16; iv. 18.)

Adv. Praxean. c. 15. Denique inspiciamus, quem Apostoli viderint. "Quod vidimus," inquit Joannes, "quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostrae contrectaverunt de sermone vitae. Sermo enim vitae caro factus," et auditus, et visus, et contrectatus, quia caro, qui ante carnem sermo tantum in primordio apud Deum patrem, non pater apud sermonem. Nam etsi Deus sermo, sed apud Deum, qui ex Deo Deus, qui cum patre apud patrem. "Et vidimus gloriam ejus, tanquam unigeniti a patre," utique filii: scilicet visibilis, glorificati a patre invisibili. (1 John i. 1; John i. 14.)

Ibid. c. 25. Caeterum, "De meo sumet," inquit, sicut ipse de patris. Ita connexus patris in filio et filii in paracleto tres efficit cohaerentes, alterum ex altero. Qui tres unum sunt non unus quomodo dictum est, "Ego et pater unum sumus;" ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. (Comp. 1 John v. 7, 8.)

15. Origen.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 9.)

Hom. in libr. Jesu Nave. (See before, p. 52.)

De orat. c. 21. Tom. I. p. 233. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 466.) Ὁ

is supposed to have been attached to the first. (See under Irenaeus on 2 John.) See other passages in Strom. IV. c. 16. 100. p. 608.

[1] Origen quotes the Epistle as John's and as catholic. In Eusebius he intimates that there were doubts regarding the second and third; but of the first he had no doubt. He uses the phrase "the Epistle of John," which might mean that he knew no other; but this meaning is not necessary. Dionysius (Eus. H. E. VII. 25) speaks of "the Epistle" in one place, while elsewhere he recognizes both the others. See Westcott, Canon, p. 334 (4th edition).

ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ὡς φησιν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ὁ Ἰωάννης, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶν, ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει. (1 John iii. 8.)

Comment. in Mat. t. 15. *c.* 31. *p.* 699. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1348.) Ἅτινα δύνασαι κατασκευάσαι καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἐπιστολῆς φάσκοντος· Παιδία, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. (1 John ii. 18.)

Ibid. t. 17. *c.* 19. *p.* 798. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1537.) Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου καθολικῆς Ἐπιστολῆς οὕτως ἔχον· Ἀγαπητοὶ νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν κ.τ.λ. (1 John iii. 2.)

Comment. in Ev. Joann. t. 2. *c.* 18. *p.* 76. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 153.) Ἐπεὶ δὲ φῶς ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐνταῦθα μὲν ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἐν δὲ τῇ Καθολικῇ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἐπιστολῇ λέγεται ὁ Θεὸς εἶναι φῶς. (1 John i. 5; Origen is writing upon John i. 4.)

Ibid. t. 19. *c.* 1. *p.* 281. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 525.) Προσεπιτείνει δὲ τὴν εἰς τὸν τόπον ἀπορίαν καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ ταῦτα λέγων· ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει. (1 John ii. 22, 23.)

16. Dionysius of Alexandria.

Eus. H. E. VII. 25. (See his views below, on Apocalypse.)[1]

17. Cyprian.

Epist. 28 (al. 25). Et Joannes Apostolus mandati memor in Epistola sua postmodum ponit: "In hoc," inquit, "intelligimus, quia cognovimus eum, si praecepta ejus custodiamus. Qui dicit, quoniam cognovit eum, et mandata ejus non servat, mendax est, et veritas in illo non est." (1 John ii. 3, 4.)

Epist. 69 (al. 76). Item beatus Joannes Apostolus nec ipse ullam haeresin, aut schisma discrevit, aut aliquos speciatim separatos posuit, sed universos, qui de Ecclesia exissent, quique contra Ecclesiam facerent, antichristos appellavit dicens: "Audistis, quia antichristus venit, nunc autem antichristi multi facti sunt. Unde cognoscimus, quia novissima hora est: ex nobis ex-

[1] Dionysius recognized all the three. See last foot-note.

ierunt, sed non fuerunt ex nobis. Si enim fuissent ex nobis, mansissent utique nobiscum." (1 John ii. 18, 19.)

De bono patient. Quod si et nos, fratres dilectissimi, in Christo sumus, si ipsum induimus, si ipse est salutis nostrae via, qui Christum vestigiis salutaribus sequimur, per Christi exempla gradiamur, sicut Joannes apostolus instruit, dicens: "Qui dicit, se in Christo manere, debet quomodo ille ambulavit et ipse ambulare." (1 Joh. ii. 6.)

18. Eusebius.

H. E. III. 3. (See before, The Epistles, p. 207.)
Ibid. III. 24. (See before, The Gospels, pp. 89, 90.)
Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

19. Athanasius.

Contra Arianos Orat. IV. c. 26. *p.* 505. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 508.) *Ὅτι δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς οὐκ ἀρχὴν ἔχει τοῦ εἶναι, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως παρὰ τῷ Πατρί ἐστι, δηλοῖ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Ἐπιστολῇ λέγων οὕτως· Ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν.* (1 John i. 1, 2.)

Epist. ad Serapion. c. 18. *p.* 533. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 576.) *Οὕτω γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔγραψεν· Ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει. Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν.* (1 John iii. 24.)

Opp. Tom. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)
Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

20. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. 4. (See before, p. 19.)

21. Epiphanius.

Haeres. 51. (See below, under Apocalypse.)
Ibid. Tom. 1. (See before, p. 21.)

22. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 9. Scripsit autem (Joannes) unam Epistolam . . . quae ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur. Reliquae autem duae . . . Joannis Presbyteri asseruntur cujus et hodie alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, &c. (See whole passage before, John, p. 187.)

Ep. II. ad Paulin. (See before, p. 21.)

XXXII.

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.[1]

(COMPARE SECTIONS I. II., ESPECIALLY II.)

[1] These two Epistles have not John's name; nor any external mark by which to make their author known to us. The very fact that he calls himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος shows that he was well known, so well known as to need no further description. If the letters be genuine they must have come from some one of high reputation; one in whose case the name of "Elder," which so many men might officially claim, had become a special term of affectionate respect. One can understand how it would be appropriate to the Apostle John in Ephesus, in his old age, the last living link between those who were with the Lord in the flesh and the men whose grandfathers were children when Christ died. This fact is the chief difficulty in the way of ascribing these letters to John the Presbyter. It is scarcely possible that if there ever was a Presbyter John, who stood so far out of the reach of being mistaken for some other man that he could use only this designation 'Presbyter' without needing to add his name, his fame would have passed away leaving only vague and doubtful traces, not so much in the reminiscences of his contemporaries as in the half-imaginary historical notes of later ages. It is not in Papias's jottings nor in Irenaeus's obscure references to one greater than himself, but in Eusebius's suppositions, that we find the basis of the fame of Presbyter John. There is no good reason to substitute this half-mythical John for the Evangelist as the writer of the two smaller Epistles. Polycarp perhaps quotes one of them; Irenaeus certainly does, and the Muratorian Canon mentions more than one Epistle, though the reading is obscure.

There has been controversy about the persons addressed. Is it in each case a person whom "the Presbyter" loved in truth? That the second Epistle was sent to the Church generally is not compatible with the salutations from the "children of her sister." That it was a salutation from one church to another is possible, but the words of the first verse, which seem to speak of her as an individual who shared with the writer and others the privilege of having truth abiding in her, make it improbable. If a person, then ἐκλεκτή is most naturally taken as descriptive, both in her case and her sister's. Ἐκλεκτή is not a proper name but a designation. But was her name Κυρία? or does Κυρία mean "lady"? On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of the latter supposition; although the conclusion is easily opposed, and cannot be proved. Of Gaius, to whom the third Epistle was addressed, nothing is known. Attempts to identify him with Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), or with Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), or with Gaius of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 14), are beyond the sphere of historical inquiry.

Both Epistles seem to have been written when the writer was on the eve of a journey in course of which he would meet his friend. Eusebius (H. E. III. 25) says that the Apostle John made tours of visitation of the churches, and this harmonizes with the tradition that those letters were written by the aged Apostle after his return from Patmos, and at a time when he superintended the churches of Asia.

1. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 7. 1. *Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν.* (2 John 7, and 1 John iv. 2, 3.)

2. Ignatius.[1]

3. Irenaeus.

B. I. 16. 3. *Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς, ἐπέτεινε τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν, μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν λέγεσθαι βουληθείς. "Ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτοῖς," φησὶ, "χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν τοῖς πονηροῖς."* (2 John 11.)

B. III. 16. 8. Et discipulus ejus Joannes in praedicta[1] epistola fugere eos praecepit dicens: "*Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Hic est seductor et Antichristus.* Videte eos, ne perdatis quod operati estis." (2 John 7, 8.)

4. Clement of Alexandria.

Eus. H. E. VI. 14. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)

Cassiodori div. lect. c. 8. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289, note 1.)

Strom. II. Ἐν τῇ μείζονι Ἐπιστολῇ. (See before, 1 John, p. 322.)

Adumbrat. in Ep. Joannis II. p. 1011. Secunda Joannis epistola, quae ad virgines[1] scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam *Electam* nomine, significat autem electionem Ecclesiae Sanctae.

[1] Ignatius. Compare as possible echo: Smyrn. c. 10. 1. ὑποδεξάμενοι (3 John 5, 6, 8).

[1] *Praedicta.* Irenaeus has quoted the First Epistle just before, and either makes a slip here, or (as some think) had the second along with the first as one letter. The readings of Irenaeus in this passage have been confirmed, and, instead of the Text. Rec., Lachmann and Tischendorf read ἐξῆλθαν (for εἰσῆλθον), ἀπολέσητε (for ἀπολέσωμεν), εἰργάσασθε (for εἰργασάμεθα).

[1] Clement. It is perhaps from this (in its Greek πρὸς Παρθένους) that the idea of its being πρὸς Πάρθους originated.

5. Origen.

Eus. H. E. VI. 26. (See before, p. 8.)
Homil. in libr. Jesu Nave. (See before, p. 52.)

6. Dionysius of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VII. 25. (See below, Apocalypse.)

7. Cyprian.

De Haer. Baptiz. Aurelius a Chullabi dixit: Joannes apostolus in epistola sua posuit dicens: "Si quis ad vos venit, et doctrinam Christi non habet, nolite eum admittere in domum vestram, et ave illi non dixeritis. Qui enim dixerit illi, ave, communicat factis ejus malis." (2 John 10, 11.)

8. Alexander Bishop of Alexandria.

Soc. H. E. I. 6. *Καὶ μηδὲ κἂν χαίρειν τοῖς τοιούτοις λέγειν, ἵνα μή ποτε καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ γενώμεθα, ὡς παρήγγειλεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης.*[1] (2 John 10.)

9. Eusebius.

Demonstr. Ev. III. 5. *Καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην δὲ ὅμοιον εὕροις ἂν τῷ Ματθαίῳ. Ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μνήμην τῆς οἰκείας προσηγορίας ποιεῖ ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει· οὐδαμοῦ δὲ Ἀπόστολον, οὐδὲ Εὐαγγελιστήν. Ἐν δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἐπισημηνάμενος, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἐδήλωσεν ὀνομαστὶ ἑαυτόν.*

H. E. III. 3. (See before, p. 207.)
Ibid. III. 24. (See before, p. 87.)
Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

[1] Dionysius. It is to be observed that although Dionysius opposed the reception of the Apocalypse, and ascribed it to Presbyter John, he never ascribes the second and third Epistles to that Presbyter, even although the opening words ὁ πρεσβύτερος might have suggested it. Nay, he refers to the 'Presbyter' being written anonymously at the opening of those Epistles, as though it were characteristic of John.

[1] Alexander wrote this letter when he heard how Eusebius of Nicomedia was favouring the Arians.

10. Athanasius.

Opp. t. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)
Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

11. Laodicene Council, A.D. 364.

(See before, p. 18. Ἰωάννου α′β′γ′.)

12. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. IV. (See before, p. 19.)

13. Epiphanius.

Haeres. I. t. 3. *h.* 34. *n.* 13. *p.* 248. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 609.) *Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς ἐπέτεινε τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν, μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ὑμῶν λέγεσθαι βουληθείς. "Ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτοῖς," φησὶ, "χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν τοῖς πονηροῖς."* (2 John 11.)

14. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 9. (See before, p. 187.)

Ibid. c. 18. (Papias.) Ex quo apparet ex ipso catalogo (in Papiae explanatione sermonum Domini) nominum, alium esse Joannem, qui inter apostolos ponitur, et alium Seniorem Joannem, quem post Aristionem enumerat. Hoc autem diximus, propter superiorem opinionem, quam a plerisque retulimus traditam, duas posteriores epistolas Joannis, non Apostoli esse, sed Presbyteri.

Epist. II. ad Paulin. (See before, p. 21.)

Epist. Evagrio. Clangat tuba evangelica, filius tonitrui, quem Jesus amavit plurimum: qui de pectore salvatoris doctrinarum fluenta potavit: "Presbyter electae domini, &c." Et in alia epistola: "Presbyter Caio."

XXXIII.

JUDE.[1]

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Hermas.[1]

3. Polycarp.

Philipp. c. 7. 2. *Διὸ ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὰς ψευδοδιδασκαλίας, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον ἐπιστρέψωμεν, νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς, κ.τ.λ.* (Jude 3; 1 Pet. iv. 7.)

[1] Jude. On the relation to 2 Peter see note 1 on 2 Peter. Jude does not call himself an Apostle and does call himself the brother of James, which makes it improbable that the Apostle Jude was the writer. He was probably brother of James the writer of the Epistle (see Mat. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). On his quotation from Enoch see below, note on Tertullian. The reference to Michael is said to be from the Assumption of Moses (see Origen, below). Hilgenf., Nov. Test. extra Can. Rec., has collected the fragments of this book. Others suppose that Jude referred to a current Jewish tradition. The date is to be inferred from the contents. Verse 17 points to the Apostles as having spoken to the readers of the Epistle. There is no reference to the Fall of Jerusalem, and this makes for a date before that catastrophe. We have concluded that 2 Peter, which was before the Fall of Jerusalem, was later than Jude (see for this also note on 2 Peter). There has been controversy as to the original language of the Epistle; but there is no good cause shown for its being other than Greek. That the Epistle made its way to a place in the Canon shows that it had powerful evidence in its favour at first; for there is much to militate against it in its first words which claim no apostolical authority, and in its references to strange traditions. Clement never calls Jude an Apostle, but Tertullian does, and Origen also (in the Latin of his works at least). Though it is not in the Peshito, Ephrem accepted it.

[1] Barnabas uses παρείσδυσιν, c. 2. 10 and c. 4. 9, so as to remind the reader of Jude 4 παρεισέδυσαν, in similarly describing the stealthy inroads of false doctrine. The word in 2 Pet. ii. 1 is παρεισάξουσιν. Comp. Gal. ii. 4, παρεισῆλθον, παρεισάκτους. In c. 4. 9 it is ἵνα μὴ σχῇ παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας, and the context shows that he is warning against false doctrine and sins of conduct as closely linked together. So also the Pastoral Epistles.

[1] Hermas has in Sim. IX. 19. 3 a passage denouncing the false teachers as beyond repentance because they became προδόται τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ λήμματος ὑπερκρίθησαν καὶ ἐδίδαξαν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων. This is parallel to 2 Pet. ii. 3; Jude 16; Titus i. 11. Compare for Paul's practice 1 Cor. ix. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 9-13.

4. Muratorian Canon.

See before, p. 7. (contains Jude.)

5. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

See before, pp. 1 and 2. (wanting in the Syriac: contained in O. L.)

6. Irenaeus.

B. IV. 36. 4. (See before, on 2 Peter, p. 315; comp. Jude 7.)

7. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Paedag. III. 44. p. 280. "*Εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς,*" *φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας,* "*βούλομαι ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἅπαξ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου λαὸν σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας, ἀπώλεσεν, ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων τετήρηκεν.*" *Καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν διδασκαλικώτατα ἐκτίθεται τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν κρινομένων·* "*οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο.*" (Jude 5, 6, 11.)

Strom. III. 11. p. 515. "*Ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι·* "*Ὁμοίως μέν τοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι·*" (*ὃ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβάλλουσιν*) *ἕως,* "*Καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα.*" (Jude 8, 16.)

Adumbrat. in Ep. Jud. p. 1007. (Dindorf, Vol. III. p. 482.) Judas, qui catholicam scripsit epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph exstans, valde religiosus, quum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, seipsum fratrem ejus esse. Sed quid dixit? "Judas, servus Jesu Christi," utpote Domini, "frater autem Jacobi."

Eus. H. E. VI. 13. (See before, Hebrews, p. 277.)

Ibid. VI. 14. (See before, Catholic Epistles, p. 289.)

Cassiodor. div. lect. c. 8. (See before, p. 289, note 1.)

[1] Clement. Cassiodorus says that Clement commented on the Canonical Epistles, *i.e.* 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John and *James;* but this last is supposed to be a mistake for *Jude.* At all events, Clement's Adumbrations in Jude are extant in Latin.

8. Tertullian.

De cultu femin. I. 3.[1] Scio scripturam Enoch, quae hunc ordinem angelis dedit, non recipi a quibusdam, quia nec in armarium Judaïcum[2] admittitur. Opinor non putaverunt illam ante cataclysmum editam, post eum casum orbis omnium rerum abolitorem, salvam esse potuisse. Si ista ratio est, recordentur pronepotem ipsius Enoch fuisse superstitem cataclysmi Noë, qui utique domestico nomine et hereditaria traditione audierat et meminerat de proavi sui penes Deum gratia, et de omnibus praedicatis ejus: cum Enoch filio suo Matusalae nihil aliud mandaverit, quam ut notitiam eorum posteris suis traderet. Igitur sine dubio potuit Noë in praedicationis delegatione successisse, vel quia et alias non tacuisset, tam de Dei conservatoris sui dispositione, quam de ipsa domus suae gloria. Hoc si non tam expedite haberet, illud quoque assertionem scripturae illius tueretur. Perinde potuit abolefactam eam violentia cataclysmi, in spiritu rursus reformare: quemadmodum et Hierosolymis Babylonia expugnatione deletis, omne instrumentum Judaicae literaturae per Esdram constat restauratum. Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de Domino praedicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari. A Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta, sicut et caetera fere quae Christum sonant. Nec utique mirum hoc, si scripturas aliquas non receperunt de eo locutas, quem et ipsum coram loquentem non erant recepturi. Eo accedit, quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.[3] (Jude 14.)

9. Origen.[1]

Hom. in Gen. (See before, p. 51.)

[1] Tertullian. Book of Enoch. See Dillmann's *Das Buch Henoch*, 1838. See also Westcott's article in Smith's Dict., Book of Enoch. Lücke, Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh., p. 89. Tertullian is the only father who gives it a place as Scripture, but it was well known to Clem. of Alex. and Origen, and apparently to Justin and Irenaeus. Some count it a Jewish Book written before the Christian era; others regard it as Christian. The most common view is an obvious compromise, viz., that it is of Jewish origin B. C. and considerably interpolated afterwards.

[2] *i.e.*, The O. T. Canon.

[3] Tertullian's only citation of Jude.

[1] Origen, in his Com. on Mat. t. 10. c. 17, speaks at some length of Jude,

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 8.)
Hom. in libr. Jesu Nave. (See before, p. 52.)

Comment. in Mat. t. 10. *c.* 17. *Tom. III. p.* 463. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 877.) *Καὶ Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν Ἐπιστολὴν, ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐῤῥωμένων λόγων, ὅστις ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἴρηκεν· Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.*

Ibid. t. 13. *c.* 28. *p.* 607. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1167.) *Καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰούδα Ἐπιστολῇ, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.* (Jude 1.)

Ibid. t. 15. *c.* 27. *p.* 693. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1435.) *Καὶ γίγνονται πολλοὶ μὲν τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ πρώτων ἔσχατοι, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ἐν ζόφῳ τηρούμενοι.* (Jude 6.)

Ibid. t. 17. *c.* 30. *p.* 814. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1569.) *Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσοιτό τις Ἐπιστολὴν, ὁράτω τί ἕπεται τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τό· Ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.* (Jude 6.)

Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. B. III. Tom. IV. p. 510. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 939.) Et nisi hac lege tenerentur, nunquam de eis diceret scriptura divina: "Angelos quoque, qui non servaverunt principatum suum, sed dereliquerunt proprium domicilium, Deus ad judicium magni diei aeternis vinculis in tartaro constrictos sub caligine reservavit." (Jude 6.)

Ibid. B. V. Tom. IV. p. 549. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1016.) Quomodo etiam quod Judas apostolus in Epistola Catholica dicit, poterit explanari? Ait enim ita: "Angelos quoque qui non servaverunt principatum suum, sed dereliquerunt, &c." (Jude 6.)

De Princip. III. 2. (Tom. I. p. 138.) Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur: de quo in Ascensione Moysi cujus libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Moysi, ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae. (Jude 9.)

and of James (Mat. xiii. 55, 56), but does not say that Jude was an Apostle; nor does he call him the brother of the James who wrote the Epistle, but of James the Lord's brother.

10. Eusebius.

H. E. II. 23. (See before, p. 298.)
Ibid. III. 3. (See before, p. 207.)
Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)

11. Athanasius.

Opp. Tom. II. p. 38. (See before, p. 13.)
Synops. Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

12. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Catech. IV. (See before, p. 19.)

13. Epiphanius.

Haeres. I. t. 2. *h.* 2. *p.* 92. Ὡς καὶ περὶ τούτων οἶμαι ἐκινήθη τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ Ἰούδᾳ, λέγω δὴ ἐν τῇ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφείσῃ καθολικῇ Ἐπιστολῇ. (Ἰούδας δέ ἐστιν οὗτος, ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Κυρίου λεγόμενος·) Ὑπέδειξε γὰρ αὐτοὺς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ Ἰούδα κατὰ τὰ κτήνη φθειρομένους καὶ φθείροντας, ὡς λέγει ὅτι Ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν ἀγνοοῦντες ἁλίσκονται· ὅσα δὲ οἴδασιν, ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα φθείρονται.

14. Jerome.

De Vir. Ill. c. 4. Judas frater Jacobi parvam, quae de septem Catholicis est, Epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur: tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur.

In Epist. ad Tit. c. 1. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 708.) Qui autem putant totum librum debere sequi eum qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enochi, de quo apostolus Judas in Epistola sua testimonium posuit, inter Ecclesiae Scripturas recipere et multa alia quae Apostolus Paulus de reconditis est loquutus.[1]

[1] Jerome is arguing against those who objected to Paul's quotation from heathen writers, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται (Titus i. 12); and his argument is that one who finds some words in a book which suit his purpose and uses them is not thereby made responsible for the rest of the book.

XXXIV.

APOCALYPSE.[1]

1. Barnabas.[1]

2. Clement of Rome.[1]

Second Epistle.

C. 17. 7. *Οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εὐπραγήσαντες καὶ ὑπομείναντες τὰς βασάνους καὶ μισήσαντες τὰς ἡδυπαθείας τῆς ψυχῆς, ὅταν θεάσωνται τοὺς ἀστοχήσαντας καὶ ἀρνησαμένους διὰ τῶν λόγων ἢ διὰ τῶν ἔργων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅπως κολάζονται δειναῖς βασάνοις πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ, ἔσονται δόξαν δόντες τῷ Θεῷ αὐτῶν λέγοντες ὅτι· Ἔσται ἐλπὶς τῷ δεδουλευκότι Θεῷ ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας.* (Comp. Apoc. xiii. 10; xiv. 12; xvi. 5. G. & H. p. 138.)

3. Hermas.[1]

Vis. I. 3. 2. (See also Sim. IX. 24. 4.) *Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν μετανοήσουσιν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐγγραφήσονται εἰς τὰς*

[1] Apocalypse. See afterwards, note "On Chapter xxxiv"; at the end of the Extracts.

[1] Barnabas. Compare as echoes: C. 7. 10 (ποδήρη), Apoc. i. 13; and c. 7. 10 also for reference to Christ's coming again as in Apoc. i. 7; c. 21. 3 (ἐγγὺς ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ), Apoc. xxii. 10, 12.

[1] Clement. This seems to be the only passage in "2 Clem." recalling the Apocalypse. There is none in Clement's own Epistle.

[1] Hermas. The correspondence of Hermas with the Apocalypse of John is remarkable. Part of it may be ascribed to Jewish sympathies, as *e.g.* the references to Michael (Sim. VIII. 3. 3, Apoc. xii. 7), the pre-eminent angels (Vis. V. 4. 1, Apoc. vii. 2) (which are six in Hermas, but the seventh is the spirit or son of God, who is also identified with Michael), the prominence given to the destructive powers of locusts (Vis. IV. 1. 6, Apoc. ix. 3), the delivery of a book containing the revelation (Vis. II. 4. 2, Apoc. x. 2. 8); all of which are found in Jewish prophecy and Apocalypses, and which might therefore be expected in two such books proceeding from a common source in Judaism. But there are others in which one borrows from the other, and in which the correspondence is not explained by referring both to Daniel; and the mode of borrowing is significant. It is not so much leading ideas as the accessories of those ideas which are borrowed. We find in Hermas that there is a book of life in which some names

βίβλους τῆς ζωῆς μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων. (Comp. Exod. xxxii. 32; Dan. xii. 1; but see Apoc. iii. 5; xiii. 8; xx. 12.)

Vis. I. 4. 1. *Ὅτε οὖν ἐτέλεσεν ἀναγινώσκουσα καὶ ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῆς καθέδρας, ἦλθαν τέσσαρες νεανίαι καὶ ἦραν τὴν καθέδραν καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολήν.* (Apoc. vii. 1, 2.)

Vis. II. 2. 7. *Μακάριοι ὑμεῖς ὅσοι, ὑπομένετε τὴν θλῖψιν τὴν ἐρχομένην τὴν μεγάλην.* (Apoc. vii. 14.)

Vis. II. 4. 1. *Τὴν πρεσβυτέραν, παρ᾽ ἧς ἔλαβες τὸ βιβλίδιον, τίνα δοκεῖς εἶναι; ἐγώ φημι· Τὴν Σίβυλλαν. Πλανᾶσαι, φησὶν, οὐκ ἔστιν. Τίς οὖν ἐστίν; φημί. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία, φησίν.* (Apoc. xii. 1.)

Vis. III. 5. 1. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν λίθοι οἱ τετράγωνοι καὶ λευκοὶ καὶ συμφωνοῦντες ταῖς ἁρμογαῖς αὐτῶν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ διάκονοι οἱ πορευθέντες κατὰ τὴν σεμνότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπήσαντες καὶ διδάξαντες καὶ διακονήσαντες ἁγνῶς καὶ σεμνῶς τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ μὲν κεκοιμημένοι, οἱ δὲ ἔτι ὄντες.* (Apoc. xxi. 14.)

Vis. IV. 1. 10. *Εἶχεν δὲ τὸ θηρίον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς χρώματα τέσσαρα· μέλαν, εἶτα πυρροειδὲς καὶ αἱματῶδες, εἶτα χρυσοῦν, εἶτα λευκόν.* (Apoc. xi. 7; xii. 3; xiii. 1; xvii. 8.)

Vis. IV. 2. 1. *Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παρελθεῖν με τὸ θηρίον καὶ προελθεῖν ὡσεὶ πόδας λ′, ἰδοὺ ὑπαντᾷ μοι παρθένος κεκοσμημένη, κ.τ.λ.* (Apoc. xxi. 2; and Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. III. 32.)

Vis. IV. 2. 4. *Πιστεύσας ὅτι δι᾽ οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.* (Acts iv. 12; Apoc. xii. 11.)

Mand. X. 3. 2. (See also Sim. VIII. 2. 5.) *Πάντοτε γὰρ*

are written down and from which some are blotted out (Vis. I. 3. 2, Sim. IX. 24. 4, comp. Exod. xxxii. 32, Dan. xii. 1; but see Apoc. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xx. 12), there is an altar on which prayers are presented before God's throne (Mand. X. 3. 2, Sim. VIII. 2, 5, Apoc. viii. 3), the church is built on Apostles and Bishops (Vis. III. 5, Apoc. XXI. 14), the church is a woman (Vis. II. 4. 1, Apoc. xii. 1), a virgin (Vis. IV. 2. 1, Apoc. xxi. 2, and Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. III. 32), the beast had crowns (Vis. IV. 1. 10, Apoc. xiii. 1), and there is great tribulation coming (Vis. II 2. 7, Apoc. vii. 14). Salvation is only through one great and holy name (Vis. IV. 2. 4, Acts iv. 12, Apoc. xii. 11), and the East is the sacred recess of the universal sacred place (Vis. I. 4. 1, Apoc. vii. 2). The central theology of Hermas (see Introduction, Hermas) is that of the New Testament; much of the ethical teaching is that of James or of John; but the accessories are from the prophecies of the O. T. and from the Apocalypse, which is so full of O. T. prophecy and figure.

λυπηροῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡ ἔντευξις οὐκ ἔχει δύναμιν τοῦ ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Apoc. viii. 3.)

4. Ignatius.[1]

Ephes. c. 15. 3. *Οὐδὲν λανθάνει τὸν Κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ ἐστίν. Πάντα οὖν ποιῶμεν, ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικοῦντος, ἵνα ὦμεν αὐτοῦ ναοὶ, καὶ αὐτὸς ᾖ ἐν ἡμῖν Θεὸς ἡμῶν.* (Apoc. xxi. 3; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 16.)

5. Papias.[1]

From *Andreas Caesariensis in Apoc.* c. 34. *Serm.* 12. Edit. Morel. Opp. S. Chrysost. p. 52. *Παπίας δὲ οὕτως ἐπὶ λέξεως· "Ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν, δηλαδὴ τῶν πάλαι θείων ἀγγέλων, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως ἔδωκεν ἄρχειν καὶ καλῶς ἄρχειν παρεγγύησε." Καὶ ἑξῆς φησίν· "Εἰς οὐδὲν δέον συνέβη τελευτῆσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν."*[2] (Apoc. xii. 7.)

Oecumenius et Arethas, Comment. in Apoc. (Cramer's Catena, Vol. VIII. p. 360.) *Τοῦτο καὶ πατέρων παράδοσις καὶ Παπίου διαδόχου τοῦ εὐαγγελίστου Ἰωάννου, οὗ καὶ ἡ προκειμένη ἀποκάλυψις, διαβεβαιοῖ· Παπίας δὲ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς λέξεως οὕτως φησὶ περὶ τοῦ πολέμου, ὅτι "εἰς οὐδὲν συνέβη τελευτῆσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν," οἱονεὶ τὴν πολεμικὴν ἐγχείρησιν· "ἐβλήθη γὰρ ὁ*

[1] Ignatius. Compare as echo: Ephes c. 14. 1, ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ τέλος (Apoc. i. 8; xxi. 6).

[1] Papias. The testimony of Papias is specially important (see before, p. 53). If it can be made out that he, who come into contact with the early disciples, perhaps with John himself, recognized the Apocalypse of John, the evidence for this book becomes at once very strong. Eusebius never says that Papias knew it (see before, p. 54); and on this silence much has been founded. On the other hand, Andreas in the fifth century seems to have read in Papias's work that he quoted the Apocalypse. Whatever may have caused the 'silence of Eusebius' in this instance, it cannot outweigh the statement and quotation by Andreas (confirmed by Arethas). The other parts of Andreas's historical summary as given in the first extract in our text are confirmed by extant documents, and there is no good reason to doubt what he says of Papias. Besides, Eusebius's words (see before, p. 56) as to Papias's chiliastic misuse of ἀποστολικὰς διηγήσεις really implies that there were such διηγήσεις — written accounts — both in Papias's hands and his own. This at once suggests the Apocalypse, and makes Eusebius imply what Andreas says explicitly.

[2] See Routh., Rel. Sac. p. 14, Gebhardt u. Harnack, Pat. Apost. I. p. 189; and Lücke, Einl. in die Offenb., Cap. V. § 30.

δράκων, ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς καὶ διάβολος καλούμενος, καὶ ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ." (Apoc. xii. 7.)

Andr. proleg. in Apoc. (Opp. S. Chrysost. t. II. Francof. p. 175.) *Περὶ μέντοι τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττὸν μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον ἡγούμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων Γρηγορίου φημὶ τοῦ Θεολόγου, καὶ Κυρίλλου, προσέτι δὲ καὶ ἀρχαιοτέρων Παπτίου, Εἰρηναίου, Μεθοδίου καὶ Ἱππολύτου ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον.*

6. Justin Martyr.

Dial. c. 81. *p.* 308 *B.* Ὡς γὰρ τῷ Ἀδὰμ εἴρητο, ὅτι, ᾗ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ φάγῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἀποθανεῖται, ἔγνωμεν αὐτὸν μὴ ἀναπληρώσαντα χίλια ἔτη. Συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι Ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγειν. Καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσειν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ, συνελόντι φάναι, αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν. — Παρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ μέχρι νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματά ἐστιν.[1]

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 9. (Joannes Apostolus) quarto decimo anno, secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano, in Patmos insulam relegatus, scripsit Apocalypsin quam interpretatur Justinus Martyr et Irenaeus.[2]

Eus. H. E. IV. 18. *Μέμνηται δὲ καὶ* [sc. ὁ Ἰουστῖνος] *τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως, σαφῶς τοῦ ἀποστόλου αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγων.*

7. Melito.[1]

Eus. H. E. IV. 26. *Τούτων εἰς ἡμετέραν γνῶσιν ἀφῖκται τὰ*

[1] Justin. This is the first explicit quotation of the Apocalypse in works which have come to us direct. The circumlocution which Justin was compelled to use is interesting as an illustration of his difficulty in quoting Christian writings as authoritative. The idea that εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ is an interpolation must be referred to subjectivity, the external evidence clearly keeping it in the text. See on this Lücke, c. V. § 31.

[2] Justin and Irenaeus are not known to have left comments on the Apocalypse.

[1] Melito was Bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches. His book is lost.

ὑποτεταγμένα· Μελίτωνος, τὰ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα δύο, . . . Καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου.

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 24. Melito de diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Joannis librum unum, etc.

8. Apollonius.[1]

Eus. H. E. V. 18. Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως· καὶ νεκρὸν δὲ δυνάμει θείᾳ πρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐγηγέρθαι ἱστορεῖ.

9. Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons.[1]

Eus. H. E. V. 1. Ἦν γὰρ καὶ ἔστι γνήσιος Χριστοῦ μαθητὴς, ἀκολουθῶν τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ. (Apoc. xiv. 4.)

Ibid. Μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐξέκαεν αὐτῶν τὴν ὀργὴν καθάπερ θηρίου, καὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος καὶ τοῦ δήμου τὸ ὅμοιον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀδικῶς ἐπιδεικνυμένων μῖσος· ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ· Ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι. (Apoc. xxii. 11.)

Ibid. c. 2. Ἀλλ' εἴποτέ τις ἡμῶν δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἢ διὰ λόγου μάρτυρας αὐτοὺς προσεῖπεν, ἐπέπλησσον πικρῶς. Ἡδέως γὰρ παρεχώρουν τὴν τῆς μαρτυρίας προσηγορίαν τῷ Χριστῷ, τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ μάρτυρι καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἀρχηγῷ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Apoc. i. 5; iii. 14.)

10. Irenaeus.[1]

B. IV. 20. 11. Sed et Joannes Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi sacerdotalem et gloriosum regni videns adventum: "Conversus sum," inquit, "videre vocem quae loquebatur mecum,

[1] Apollonius, an ecclesiastical writer in Asia Minor, wrote against Montanus, forty years after Montanus began to prophesy.

[1] This testimony occupies the same ground as that of Irenaeus.

[1] Irenaeus's testimony is very important. It is clearly for John the Apostle. The words *Domini discipulus* in the first extract are to be interpreted with consideration of the fact that he also (B. III. 1, 1) calls the author of the Gospel of John *discipulus Domini*. The testimony of Irenaeus is much weakened in the opinion of critics by his ascribing the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian. It is usual to give it an earlier date. But Irenaeus is not therefore mistaken. See extract from B. V. 30. 3. below.

et conversus vidi septem candelabra aurea, et inter candelabra similem filio hominis indutum poderem, et cinctum ad mammas zonam auream. Caput autem ejus et capilli albi, quemadmodum lana alba, quomodo nix; et oculi ejus ut flamma ignis, et pedes ejus similes chalcolibano, quemadmodum in camino succensus est. Et vox ejus quasi vox aquarum, et habet stellas septem in manu dextera sua, et de ore ejus romphaea ex utraque parte acuta exibat, et facies ejus quemadmodum sol fulgens in virtute sua." (Apoc. i. 12, &c.)

B. V. 26. 1. Manifestius adhuc etiam de novissimo tempore, et de his qui sunt in eo decem regibus, in quos dividetur quod nunc regnat imperium, significavit Joannes Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi, edisserens quae fuerint decem cornua, quae a Daniele visa sunt, dicens sic dictum esse sibi: "Et decem cornua quae vidisti, decem reges sunt, qui regnum nondum acceperunt, sed potestatem quasi reges una hora accipient cum bestia. Hi unam sententiam habent, et virtutem et potestatem suam bestiae dant. Hi cum agno pugnabunt, et agnus vincet eos, quoniam Dominus Dominorum est, et rex regum." (Apoc. xvii. 12, &c.)

B. V. 30. 3. *Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.*

Eus. H. E. V. 8. *Ἐν δὲ τῷ πέμπτῳ περὶ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως, καὶ τῆς ψήφου τῆς τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου προσηγορίας οὕτω διαλαμβάνει· "Τούτων*[2] *δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς*

[2] This is found in the Latin transl. of Irenaeus B. V. 30. 1, as follows: "*His autem sic se habentibus, et in omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et veteribus scripturis numero hoc posito, et testimonium perhibentibus his, qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt, et ratione docente nos, quoniam numerus nominis bestiae, secundum Graecorum computationem, per literas quae in eo sunt, sexcentos habebit et sexaginta et sex; hoc est decadas aequales hecatontasin et hecatontadas aequales monasin (numerus enim qui digitus [digitos] sex, similiter custoditus, recapitulationes ostendit universae apostasiae ejus quae initio, et quae in mediis temporibus, et quae in fine erit) ignoro quomodo erraverunt quidam sequentes idiotismum, et medium frustrantes numerum nominis, quinquaginta numeros deducentes, pro sex decadis unam decadem volentes esse. Hoc autem arbitror scriptorum peccatum fuisse, ut solet fieri, quoniam et per literas numeri ponuntur, facile literam Graecam* (scil. ξ), *quae sexaginta enuntiat numerum, in Iota Graecorum literam expansam; post deinde quidam sine exquisitione hoc acceperunt; alii quidem simpliciter et idiotice usurpaverunt denarium numerum: quidam autem per ignorantiam ausi sunt et nomina exquirere, habentia falsum erroris numerum. Sed his quidem qui simpliciter et sine malitia hoc fecerunt, arbitramur veniam dari a Deo.*"

σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τούτου κειμένου, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων, καὶ τοῦ λόγου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς ὅτι ὁ ἀριθμὸς τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ψῆφον διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων ἐμφαίνεται." *Καὶ ὑποκαταβὰς περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φάσκει·* "*Ἡμεῖς γοῦν οὐκ ἀποκινδυνεύομεν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου ἀποφαινόμενοι βεβαιωτικῶς. Εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ, δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐρρέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος· οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.*" *Ταῦτα καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἱστορεῖται τῷ δεδηλομένῳ.*

11. Athenagoras.

Legatio, c. 36. *Καὶ ἀποδώσειν μὲν νομίζειν τὴν γῆν τοὺς ἰδίους νεκρούς.* (Apoc. xx. 13.)

12. Theophilus.

Eus. H. E. IV. 24. *Καὶ ἄλλο πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν Ἑρμογένους τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον, ἐν ᾧ ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις.*[1]

Ad Autolyc. II. 28. *p.* 104. *Ταύτην τὴν Εὔαν, διὰ τὸ ἀρχῆθεν πλανηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως καὶ ἀρχηγὸν ἁμαρτίας γεγονέναι, ὁ κακοποιὸς δαίμων, ὁ καὶ Σατὰν καλούμενος, ὁ τότε διὰ τοῦ ὄφεως λαλήσας αὐτῇ, ἕως καὶ τοῦ δεῦρο ἐνεργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐνθουσιαζομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώποις, Εὔαν ἐκκαλεῖται. Δαίμων δὲ καὶ δράκων καλεῖται. . . .* (Apoc. xii. 3, &c.)

13. Clement of Alexandria.[1]

Strom. VI. 13. *p.* 793. *Κἂν ἐνταῦθα ἐπὶ γῆς πρωτοκαθεδρίᾳ μὴ τιμηθῇ, ἐν τοῖς εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρσι καθεδεῖται θρόνοις,*

[1] Theophilus, as Bishop of Antioch, gives the testimony of the Syrian church. Hermogenes was an opponent of Montanism. The book was in such esteem that it could be quoted as an authority. (See Lücke, Einl. in d. Offenb. c. V. § 32.)

[1] Clement frequently cites the Apocalypse as Scripture.

τὸν λαὸν κρίνων, ὡς φησὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης. (Apoc. iv. 4; xi. 16; cf. Mat. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30.)

Paedag. II. 12. *p.* 241. *Λίθοις δὲ ἁγίοις τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ τετειχίσθαι παρειλήφαμεν, καὶ τὰς δώδεκα τῆς οὐρανοπόλεως πύλας τιμίοις ἀπεικασμένας λίθοις τὸ περίοπτον τῆς ἀποστολικῆς φωνῆς αἰνίττεσθαι χάριτος ἐκδεχόμεθα.* (Apoc. xxi. 21.)

14. Tertullian.[1]

De praescript. haeret. c. 33. Joannes in Apocalypsi idolothyta edentes et stupra committentes jubetur castigare. (Apoc. ii. 20.) At in epistola eos maxime Antichristos vocat qui Christum negarent in carne[m] venisse et qui non putarent Jesum esse filium Dei.

Adv. Marcion. III. 14. Nam et apostolus Joannes in Apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Dei prodeuntem, bis acutum, praeacutum, quem intelligi oportet sermonem divinum, bis acutum duobus testamentis legis et evangelii, &c.

Ibid. IV. 5. Habemus et Joannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus in Joannem stabit auctorem.

15. Caius.[1]

Eus. H. E. III. 28. *Γάϊος, οὗ φωνὰς ἤδη πρότερον παρατέθειμαι, ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ αὐτοῦ ζητήσει, ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γράφει· Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τερατολογίας ἡμῖν, ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας, ψευδόμενος, ἐπεισάγει, λέγων, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις*

[1] Tertullian's citations of the Apocalypse are not affected one way or other by his Montanist views. He consistently treated it as Scripture.

[1] Caius. It appears that Caius was an Anti-Montanist opponent of the Apocalypse, and denied that it was the work of the Apostle John, ascribing it on the contrary to Cerinthus. That Cerinthus wrote an Apocalypse is not said by other writers of the period. Theodoret (Fab. Haeret. 2. 3) says: Κήρινθος καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις τινὰς ὡς αὐτὸς τεθεαμένος ἐπλάσατο, καὶ ἀπειλῶν τινων διδασκαλίας συνέθηκε, καὶ ποῦ Κυρίου τὴν βασιλείαν ἔφησεν ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. But this obscure statement is not accepted, seeing it seems to be founded on a misconception of Eusebius. 'Visions' put forth as though 'written by a great Apostle' —that is Caius's description of the Johannine Apocalypse, which (from the necessities of controversy) he ascribes to Cerinthus.

καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. Καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀριθμὸν χιλιοντα-ετίας ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς, θέλων πλανᾶν, λέγει γίνεσθαι.

16. Muratorian Fragment.

(See before, pp. 3-8.)

17. Syriac and Old Latin Versions.

(See before, pp. 1. 2.)

18. Origen.[1]

Hom. in libr. Jesu Nave. (See before, p. 52.)

Eus. H. E. VI. 25. (See before, p. 8.)

Comment. in Mat. t. 16. Tom. III. p. 719. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1386.) Εἴ γε ἔχειν λόγον τὸ τοιοῦτον δόξαι τισὶ, πεπώκασι δὲ ποτήριον καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου υἱοὶ, ἐπείπερ Ἡρώδης μὲν ἀπέκτεινεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ· ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον. Διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἑαυτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα· Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει, καὶ βασιλείᾳ, καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς· καὶ ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρακέναι. (Apoc. i. 9.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 1. Tom. IV. p. 16. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 47.) Φησὶν οὖν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου Ἰωάννης· καὶ εἶδον ἄγγελον πετόμενον ἐν μεσουρανήματι, ἔχοντα εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον, εὐαγγελίσασθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κ.τ.λ. (Apoc. xiv. 6, 7.)

Comment. in Joann. t. 2. Tom. IV. p. 55. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 117.) Καλῶς μέντοι γε διαγράφων τὰ περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ

[1] Origen supposes the Apocalypse to have been seen by John the son of Zebedee. He was not a Millenarian, but he was a Critic, and his support of the ordinary tradition is therefore valuable.

Ἀποκαλύψει ὁ ἀπόστολος, καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελίστης, ἤδη δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ προφήτης, φησὶ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἑωρακέναι ἐν ἀνεῳγότι τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἐφ' ἵππῳ λευκῷ ὀχούμενον. (Apoc. xix. 11.)

19. Hippolytus.[1]

Canon Paschal. *Ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ Ἀποκαλύψεως.*

Ebedjesu catal. libr. Syr. c. 8. Sanctus Hippolytus martyr episcopus composuit librum de dispensatione . . . et apologiam pro Apocalypsi et Evangelio Joannis apostoli et evangelistae.

De Christo et Antichr. c. 36. (Lagarde p. 17.) *Ταῦτα μὲν προφητεύει σοι Ἡσαΐας, ἴδωμεν δὲ εἰ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶν ἐφθέγξατο ὁ Ἰωάννης. Οὗτος γὰρ ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ὢν, ὁρᾷ Ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίων φρικτῶν, ἅτινα διηγούμενος ἀφθόνως καὶ ἑτέρους διδάσκει. Λέγε μοι, μακάριε Ἰωάννη, ἀπόστολε καὶ μαθητὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, τί εἶδες καὶ ἤκουσας περὶ Βαβυλῶνος, γρηγόρησον καὶ εἰπέ· καὶ γὰρ αὐτή σε ἐξώρισε. "Καὶ ἦλθεν εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας," κ.τ.λ.* (Apoc. xvii. 1-18.)

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 61. Scripsit (sc. Hippolytus) nonnullos in scripturas commentarios, e quibus hos reperi: in Hexaemeron . . . de Apocalypsi, &c.

20. Dionysius of Alexandria.[1]

Eus. H. E. VII. 10. *Αὖθις δὴ οὖν ὁ Διονύσιος οἷα καὶ περὶ τούτου* (sc. *Οὐαλεριανοῦ*) *διέξεισιν, ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἑρμάμμωνα ἐπι-*

[1] Hippolytus. There was found on a statue in Rome in 1551 an inscription (quoted extract No. 1) giving a list of his works which extract No. 2 confirms. The work against Heresies, recently discovered, often refers to the Apocalypse. In his miscellaneous works which remain, Hippolytus makes frequent allusion to the Apocalypse. See Lagarde's Index. He usually calls him John. On one occasion he says that as Christ's first appearing (παρουσία) had John the Baptist as forerunner, so will His second, when He cometh in glory, manifest Enoch and Elias and Ἰωάννην τὸν Θεολόγον (Περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου, § 21. p. 104); in another (ibid. § 28. p. 110), speaking of the mystic 666, he confesses that he does not understand the symbolism, but suggests ἀρνοῦμαι (spelt ἀρνεῦμε), inasmuch as it is the characteristic of the adversary to *deny*.

[1] Dionysius argues that the Book cannot be by the Apostle John, because it is not the custom of that John to name himself in his writings, while the seer of the Apocalypse does often and emphatically name himself. He also founds

στολῆς μαθεῖν ἔστιν, ἐν ᾗ τοῦτον ἱστορεῖ τρόπον· "Καὶ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ ὁμοίως ἀποκαλύπτεται. Καὶ ἐδόθη γὰρ αὐτῷ, φησὶ, στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ βλασφημίαν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία καὶ μῆνες τεσσαράκοντα δύο. Ἀμφότερα δέ ἐστιν ἐπὶ Οὐαλεριανοῦ θαυμάσαι." (Apoc. xiii. 5.)

Ibid. VII. 24. (Occasion of Dionysius writing on the Apocalypse.) Ἐπὶ τούτοις ἅπασιν σπουδάζεται αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν δύο συγγράμματα. Ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεσις αὐτῷ Νέπως ἦν ἐπίσκοπος τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον, Ἰουδαϊκώτερον τὰς ἐπηγγελμένας τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἐπαγγελίας ἀποδοθήσεσθαι διδάσκων, καί τινα χιλιάδα ἐτῶν τρυφῆς σωματικῆς ἐπὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς ταύτης ἔσεσθαι ὑποτιθέμενος. Λόξας γοῦν οὗτος ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου τὴν ἰδίαν κρατύνειν ὑπόληψιν, ἔλεγχον ἀλληγοριστῶν, λόγον τινὰ περὶ τούτου συντάξας ἐπέγραψε. Πρὸς ὃν ὁ Διονύσιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν ἐνίσταται, διὰ μὲν τοῦ προτέρου τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην ἣν εἶχε περὶ τοῦ δόγματος παρατιθέμενος, διὰ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου περὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου διαλαμβάνων· ἔνθα τοῦ Νέπωτος κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν μνημονεύσας, ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφει, κ.τ.λ.[2]

Ibid. VII. 25. (Dionysius disagrees with those who would set the Apocalypse aside.) Εἶθ' ἑξῆς ὑποβὰς περὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου ταῦτά φησι· "Τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν πάντῃ τὸ βιβλίον, καθ' ἕκαστον κεφάλαιον διευθύνοντες, ἄγνωστόν τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστον ἀποφαίνοντες, ψεύδεσθαί τε τὴν ἐπιγραφήν. Ἰωάννου γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι λέγουσιν· ἀλλ' οὐδ' Ἀποκάλυψιν εἶναι, τὴν σφόδρα καὶ παχεῖ κεκαλυμμένην τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας παραπετάσματι· καὶ οὐχ ὅπως τῶν ἀποστόλων τινὰ, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν ἁγίων ἢ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τούτου γεγονέναι ποιητὴν τοῦ συγγράμματος· Κήρινθον δὲ τὸν καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου κληθεῖσαν Κηρινθιανὴν συστησάμενον αἵρεσιν, ἀξιόπιστον ἐπιφημίσαι θελήσαντα τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πλάσματι ὄνομα. Τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ τὸ δόγμα, ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν, καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρ-

on the difference in style and thought—especially on the different character of the Greek—and indeed anticipates most of the modern objections on internal grounds. He ascribes the composition to the other John whose tomb is in Ephesus.

[2] Here Dionysius speaks of the work of Nepos, and of its dangerous character.

κικὸς, ἐν τούτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμοναῖς, τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ ποτοῖς καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ᾠήθη ποριεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀθετῆσαι μὲν οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιμι τὸ βιβλίον, πολλῶν αὐτὸ διὰ σπουδῆς ἐχόντων ἀδελφῶν, μείζονα δὲ τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ φρονήσεως τὴν ὑπόληψιν τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ λαμβάνων, κεκρυμμένην εἶναί τινα καὶ θαυμασιωτέραν τὴν καθ' ἕκαστον ἐκδοχὴν ὑπολαμβάνω. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ συνίημι, ἀλλ' ὑπονοῶ γε νῦν τινὰ βαθύτερον ἐγκεῖσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν. Οὐκ ἰδίῳ ταῦτα μετρῶν καὶ κρίνων λογισμῷ, πίστει δὲ τὸ πλέον νέμων, ὑψηλότερα ἢ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταληφθῆναι νενόμικα· καὶ οὐκ ἀποδοκιμάζω ταῦτα ἃ μὴ συνεώρακα θαυμάζω δὲ μᾶλλον ὅτι μὴ καὶ εἶδον."

(John the Son of Zebedee never names himself, but this John names himself often.) Ἐπὶ τούτοις τὴν ὅλην τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως βασανίσας γραφὴν, ἀδύνατον δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον ἀποδείξας νοεῖσθαι διάνοιαν, ἐπιφέρει λέγων· "Συντελέσας δὴ πᾶσαν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὴν προφητείαν, μακαρίζει ὁ προφήτης τούς τε φυλάσσοντας αὐτὴν, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἑαυτόν. Μακάριος γάρ φησιν ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Καλεῖσθαι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν Ἰωάννου ταύτην, οὐκ ἀντερῶ. Ἁγίου μὲν γάρ εἶναί τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συναινῶ. Οὐ μὲν ῥᾳδίως ἂν συνθείμην τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἀπόστολον, τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδαίου, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐπιγεγραμμένον καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολική. Τεκμαίρομαι γὰρ ἔκ τε τοῦ ἤθους ἑκατέρων, καὶ τοῦ τῶν λόγων εἴδους, καὶ τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου διεξαγωγῆς λεγομένης, μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ παρεγγράφει, οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτὸν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὔτε διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς." Εἶθ' ὑποβὰς, πάλιν· "Ἰωάννης δὲ οὐδαμοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου· ὁ δὲ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν γράψας, εὐθύς τε ἐν ἀρχῇ ἑαυτὸν προτάσσει· Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἐν τάχει. Καὶ ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ ὅσα εἶδεν. Εἶτα καὶ ἐπιστολὴν γράφει· Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ ἀπεριττῶς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ μυσ-

τηρίου τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο· Ὃ ἦν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ γὰρ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει καὶ ὁ Κύριος τὸν Πέτρον ἐμακάρισεν, εἰπών, Μακάριος εἶ Σίμων βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καί τοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Οὗτος δέ γε οὐδὲ αὐταρκες ἐνόμισεν, εἰσάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, διηγεῖσθαι τὰ ἑξῆς, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἀναλαμβάνει. Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ δὴ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει ταῦτα εἶπε· Μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα.

(There must have been many Johns, but this author does not say which John he was.) Ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἰωάννης ἐστὶν ὁ ταῦτα γράφων, αὐτῷ λέγοντι πιστευτέον· ποῖος δὲ οὗτος, ἄδηλον. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ πολλαχοῦ, τὸν ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴν, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀναπεσόντα ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ τὸν Ἰακώβου ἀδελφὸν, οὐδὲ τὸν αὐτόπτην καὶ αὐτήκοον τοῦ Κυρίου γενόμενον. Εἶπε γὰρ ἄν τι τούτων τῶν προδεδηλωμένων, σαφῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐμφανίσαι βουλόμενος. Ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν. Ἀδελφὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸν εἶπε καὶ μάρτυρα Ἰησοῦ, καὶ μακάριον ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ καὶ ἀκοῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων. Πολλοὺς δὲ ὁμωνύμους Ἰωάννῃ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ νομίζω γεγονέναι, οἳ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀγάπην, καὶ τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ ζηλοῦν, ἀγαπηθῆναί τε ὁμοίως αὐτῷ βούλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἠσπάσαντο. Ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τοῖς τῶν πιστῶν παισὶν ὀνομάζεται.

(John Mark was not the author. Two tombs at Ephesus.) Ἔστι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερος Ἰωάννης ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μάρκος· ὃν Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος ἑαυτοῖς συμπαρέλαβον, περὶ οὗ καὶ πάλιν λέγει· εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην. Εἰ δὲ οὗτος ὁ γράψας ἐστὶν, οὐκ ἂν φαίην· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀφίχθαι σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν γέγραπται· ἀλλὰ, "Ἀναχθέντες μὲν," φησὶν, "ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περὶ Παῦλον ἦλ-

θον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν, ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα." Ἄλλον δέ τινα οἶμαι τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων· ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι.[3] Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νοημάτων δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς συντάξεως αὐτῶν, εἰκότως ἕτερος οὗτος παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον ὑπονοηθήσεται.

(Agreement between Gospel and Epistles.) Συνᾴδουσι μὲν γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὁμοίως τε ἄρχονται. Τὸ μέν φησιν, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἡ δὲ, Ὃ ἦν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. Τὸ μέν φησιν Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν, ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός· ἡ δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ σμικρῷ παρηλλαγμένα· Ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη. Ταῦτα γὰρ προανακρούεται διατεινόμενος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐδήλωσε πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ φάσκοντας ἐληλυθέναι τὸν Κύριον· δι᾽ ἃ καὶ συνῆψεν ἐπιμελῶς, Καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν, μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν· ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. Ἔχεται αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν προθέσεων οὐκ ἀφίσταται. Διὰ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν κεφαλαίων καὶ ὀνομάτων ταῦτα διεξέρχεται· ὧν τινὰ μὲν ἡμεῖς συντόμως ὑπομνήσομεν. Ὁ δὲ προσεχῶς ἐντυγχάνων εὑρήσει ἐν ἑκατέρῳ πολλὴν τὴν ζωὴν, πολὺ τὸ φῶς, ἀποτροπὴν τοῦ σκότους, συνεχῆ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὴν χάριν, τὴν χαρὰν, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης ἐντολὴν, ὡς πάσας δεῖ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολάς· ὁ ἔλεγχος τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ διαβόλου, τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἡ υἱοθεσία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἡ διόλου πίστις ἡμῶν ἀπαιτουμένη, ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς παντα-χοῦ· καὶ ὅλως διὰ πάντων χαρακτηρίζοντας, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συνορᾷν τοῦ τε εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς χρῶτα πρόκειται.

(Apocalypse quite different, especially in phraseology.) Ἀλ-

[3] Dionysius has no great certainty regarding the two tombs. When he dismisses the idea of John Mark being the author of the Apocalypse, he puts forward John Presbyter very modestly—οἶμαι—he cannot speak positively. Nor is his diffidence unnatural when we see that his only evidence is that there were two tombs in Ephesus, as Eusebius also records. But how Dionysius concludes that the words and the composition betokened 'this other' John does not appear.

λοιοτάτη δὲ καὶ ξένη παρὰ ταῦτα ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις, μήτε ἐφαπτομένη, μήτε γειτνιῶσα τούτων μηδενὶ σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν, μηδὲ συλλαβὴν πρὸς αὐτὰ κοινὴν ἔχουσα· ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ μνήμην τινὰ, οὐδὲ ἔννοιαν, οὔτε ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως ἔχει· ἐῶ γὰρ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· οὔτε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις· Παύλου διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ὑποφήναντός τι καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων αὐτοῦ, ἃς οὐκ ἐνέγραψε καθ᾽ αὑτάς. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς φράσεως τὴν διαφοράν ἐστι τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀπταίστως κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιώτατα ταῖς λέξεσι, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεσι τῆς ἑρμηνείας γέγραπται. Πολλοῦ γε δεῖ βάρβαρόν τινα φθόγγον, ἢ σολοικισμὸν ἢ ὅλως ἰδιωτισμὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρεθῆναι. Ἑκάτερον γὰρ εἶχεν, ὡς ἔοικε, τὸν λόγον, ἀμφοτέρους αὐτῷ χαρισαμένου τοῦ Κυρίου, τόν τε τῆς γνώσεως, τόν τε τῆς φράσεως. Τούτῳ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν μὲν ἑωρακέναι, καὶ γνῶσιν εἰληφέναι καὶ προφητείαν, οὐκ ἀντερῶ, διάλεκτον μέντοι καὶ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς Ἑλληνίζουσαν αὐτῷ βλέπω, ἀλλ᾽ ἰδιώμασίν τε βαρβαρικοῖς χρώμενον, καί που καὶ σολοικίζοντα. Ὅπερ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον νῦν ἐκλέγειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπισκώπτων, μή τις νομίσῃ, ταῦτα εἶπον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὴν ἀνομοιότητα διευθύνων τούτων τῶν γραφῶν."

21. Cyprian.

De bono patient. Pater Deus praecepit filium suum adorari . . . et in Apocalypsi angelus Joanni volenti adorare se resistit et dicit: "Vide ne feceris, quia conservus tuus sum, et fratrum tuorum. Jesum Dominum adora." (Apoc. xix. 10.)

De eleemos. Audi in Apocalypsi Domini tui vocem, ejusmodi homines justis objurgationibus increpantem: "Dicis," inquit, "dives sum, et ditatus sum, et nullius rei egeo, et nescis quoniam tu es miser, et miserabilis, et pauper, et coecus, et nudus es. Suadeo tibi emere a me aurum ignitum de igne, ut sis dives, et vestem albam vestiaris, et non appareat in te foeditas nuditatis tuae, et collyrio inunge oculos tuos ut videas. (Apoc. iii. 17, 18.)

Epist. 63. (*Ad Caecilium.*) Aquas namque populos significare, in Apocalypsis scriptura divina declarat dicens: "Aquae quas vidisti, super quas sedit meretrix illa, populi, et turbae, et gentes

ethnicorum sunt et linguae," quod scilicet perspicimus et in sacramento calicis contineri. (Apoc. xvii. 15.)

22. Methodius.[1]

Andr. proleg. in Apoc. (See before, under Papias, p. 339.)

Conviv. (p. 70.) Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀρχιπάρθενος, ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἀρχιποίμην καὶ ἀρχιπροφήτης γέγονεν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας, τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ὁ χριστόληπτος ἡμῖν παρέστησεν ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννης, λέγων· Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σιὼν . . . οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν· παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν. Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ. (Apoc. xiv. 1-14.)

23. Victorinus Petavionensis.[1]

De fabrica mundi. (Cave, Hist. Lit. Tom. I. p. 104.) Itaque sine dubio autem diei angeli 12, noctis angeli 12, pro numero scilicet horarum; hi sunt namque 24 testes dierum et noctium, qui sedent ante thronum Dei coronas aureas in capitibus suis habentes; quos in Apocalypsi Joannis Apostoli et Evangelistae seniores vocat, idcirco quia seniores sunt et aliis angelis et hominibus. (Apoc. iv. 4.)

In Apocal. (In Lardner, Part. II. C. LVI.) Liber apertus Apocalypsis est, quam Joannes vidit.

Ibid. Hoc est, quoniam quando hoc vidit Joannes, erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Caesare. Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin. Et cum senior jam putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano, omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt, et Joannes de metallo dimissus. Sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Domino Apocalypsin. Hoc est, "oportet te iterum prophetare."

[1] Methodius, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, wrote against Porphyry, and (concerning the Resurrection) against Origen. Eusebius does not mention him—perhaps because he opposed Origen. The work quoted is 'Banquet of ten Virgins.' He is quoted by Andreas (see extract 1) as attesting the inspiration of the book. It is probable, though not explicitly stated, that he believed the writer to be John the Apostle. See Lardner, II. 107.

[1] Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau in Pannonia, who died a martyr under Diocletian in A.D. 303. His Commentary on the Apocalypse is the oldest now extant. Its genuineness is not undisputed.

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 74. Victorinus, Petavionensis episcopus, non aeque Latine ut Graece novit. Unde opera ejus grandia sensibus, viliora videntur compositione verborum. Sunt autem haec: Commentarii in Genesin . . . in Apocalypsin Joannis . . . et multa alia.

Cassiodor. Inst. Div. c. 5. De quo libro (Apocalypsi) et Victorinus saepe dictus episcopus difficillima quaedam loca tractavit.

24. Pamphilus.

Apol. pro Orig. (Opp. Orig. Tom. IV. Appendix p. 39.) Ait Joannes in Revelatione sua: "Et reddidit mare mortuos quos habebat in se, et mors et inferus reddiderunt mortuos suos qui erant in eis." (Apoc. xx. 13.)

25. Lactantius.

Epit. c. 42. (p. 1276.) Hujus (sc. filii Dei) nomen nulli est notum, nisi ipsi et Patri, sicut docet Joannes in Revelatione. (Apoc. xix. 12.)

Instit. VII. 10. (p. 913.) Qui autem se vitiis ac sceleribus contaminaverit, voluptatique servierit, is vero damnatus aeternam luet poenam, quam divinae literae secundam mortem nominant, quae est et perpetua, et gravissimis cruciatibus plena. (Apoc. ii. 11; xxi. 8.)

26. Eusebius.[1]

H. E. III. 24. (See before, p. 90.)
Ibid. III. 25. (See before, p. 10.)
Ibid. III. 39. (See before, p. 55.)

Demonstr. Ev. 8 (p. 386 D.) *Ὅθεν ἰδοὺ, φησὶν, ἐνίκησεν ὁ λεὼν ὁ ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤνοιξε τὰς σφραγῖδας τὰς*

[1] Eusebius is unable to pronounce a decided opinion on the Apocalypse. There is always something like εἰ φανείη in his mind and in his expression. His Anti-Millenarian views tended to make him disinclined to admit the book on which Millenarians founded their case; while his real honesty made him incapable of letting such feelings rule his judgment. Impressed with the able arguments of Dionysius, he swayed to and fro.

ἐπικειμένας τῷ βιβλίῳ, κατὰ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου. (Apoc. v. 5.)

H. E. III. 18. *Ἐν τούτῳ κατέχει λόγος τὸν ἀπόστολον ἅμα καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἔτι τῷ βίῳ ἐνδιατρίβοντα, τῆς εἰς τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἕνεκεν μαρτυρίας, Πάτμιον οἰκεῖν καταδικασθῆναι τὴν νῆσον. Γράφων γέ τοι ὁ Εἰρηναῖος περὶ τῆς ψήφου τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀντίχριστον προσηγορίας φερομένης ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου λεγομένῃ Ἀποκαλύψει, αὐταῖς συλλαβαῖς ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου φησίν· "Εἰ δὲ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ, δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐῤῥέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομιτιανοῦ ἀρχῆς."*

Ibid. III. 29. *Ἐπὶ τούτων δῆτα καὶ ἡ λεγομένη τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν αἵρεσις ἐπὶ σμικρότατον συνέστη χρόνον. Ἧς δὴ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις μνημονεύει.*

27. Athanasius.

Canon of Athanas. (See before, p. 13.)

Synopsis ascribed to Athanas. (See before, p. 15.)

Contra Arianos Or. 1. Tom. I. p. 317. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 33.) *Οὐδεμία γὰρ τῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν τοιοῦτόν τι περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀεὶ τὸ ἄϊδιον, καὶ τὸ συνεῖναι ἀεὶ τῷ Πατρί· Ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει τάδε λέγει, Ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, ὁ ἐρχόμενος.* (Apoc. i. 8.)

Ibid. Or. 2. Tom. I. p. 394. (Migne, Vol. II. p. 196.) *Ἄγγελος δὲ θέλοντα προσκυνῆσαι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει κωλύει, λέγων· ὅρα μή· σύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ, καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν τηρούντων τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον.* (Apoc. xxii. 9.)

28. Cyril.

Canon of Cyril. (See before, p. 19.)

29. Epiphanius.

Canon of Epiph. (See before, p. 21.)

Haeres. II. t. 1. *h.* 51. *p.* 423. (*Concerning the Alogi.*) Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν Λόγον οὐ δέχονται τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένον, Ἄλογοι κληθήσονται. Ἀλλότριοι τοίνυν παντάπασιν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ κηρύγματος τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀρνοῦνται τὸ καθαρὸν τοῦ κηρύγματος, καὶ οὔτε τὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Εὐαγγέλιον δέχονται, οὔτε τὴν αὐτοῦ Ἀποκάλυψιν. Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐδέχοντο τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν δὲ Ἀποκάλυψιν ἀπεβάλλοντο, ἐλέγομεν ἄν, μή πη ἄρα κατὰ ἀκριβολογίαν τοῦτο ποιοῦνται, ἀπόκρυφον μὴ δεχόμενοι, διὰ τὰ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει βαθέως καὶ σκοτεινῶς εἰρημένα· ὁπότε δὲ οὐ δέχονται φύσει τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένα, παντί τῳ δῆλον εἴη, ὅτι οὗτοι εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι τούτοις, περὶ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης ἐν ταῖς καθολικαῖς Ἐπιστολαῖς· ὅτι "Ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστὶ, καὶ ἠκούσατε ὅτι Ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται· καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ Ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ," κ.τ.λ.

Ibid. II. t. 1. *h.* 51. *p.* 454. Φάσκουσι δὲ κατὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τάδε χλευάζοντες· Τί με, φησὶν, ὠφελεῖ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, λέγουσά μοι περὶ ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων, καὶ ἑπτὰ σαλπίγγων, οὐκ εἰδότες, πῶς ἀναγκαία καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοιαῦτα ὑπῆρξεν ἐν τῇ ὀρθότητι τοῦ κηρύγματος. Ὅσα γὰρ ἦν ἐν νόμῳ καὶ ἐν προφήταις σκοτεινὰ καὶ αἰνιγματώδη, ταῦτα ὁ Κύριος ᾠκονόμησε διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος εἰς ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ ἀποκαλύψαι· τὰ ἐκεῖσε σκοτεινὰ, ὧδε εἰς πνευματικὰ καὶ ἔκδηλα κηρύττων. . . . p. 455. Συνάδοντος τοίνυν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἀποστόλῳ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει, ποία τις ὑπολείπεται ἀντιλογία; Πῶς δὲ οὐκ εὐθὺς ἑκάστη πλάνη ἐλεγχθήσεται, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἁγίων δεδωκότος μαρτυρίαν; . . . p. 456. Οὐχ ὁρᾶτε, ὦ οὗτοι, ὅτι περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν λέγει τῶν ἐν οἰήσει προφητείας ἀπατωμένων καὶ ἀπατωσῶν πολλούς; φημὶ δὲ περὶ Πρισκίλλας, καὶ Μαξιμίλλας, καὶ Κυϊντίλλας, ὧν οὐ λέληθε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἡ αὐτῶν ἀπάτη· ἀλλὰ προεθέσπισε προφητικῶς ἐν τῷ στόματι τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου, ὅπερ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου κοίμησιν. Αὐτοῦ δὲ προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἀνωτάτω, ὅτε εἰς τὴν Πάτμον νῆσον ὑπῆρξεν (ὁμολογοῦσι γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ἐν Θυατείροις ταῦτα πεπληρῶσθαι), ἆρα γοῦν κατὰ προφητείαν ἔγραφε τοῖς ἐκεῖ ἐν Χριστῷ κατ' ἐκεῖνο πεπολιτευμένοις, ὅτι ἤμελλεν ἑαυτὴν γυνὴ προφῆτιν καλεῖν. Καὶ διέπεσεν ὁ κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπεγειρόμενος πανταχόθεν ἐπενενοημένος λόγος, δεικνυμένου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν λόγου

προφητικοῦ ὄντος, ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου κατὰ ἀλήθειαν· Ἐπαίρονται δὲ πάλιν τῇ διανοίᾳ οἱ αὐτοὶ λεξιθηροῦντες ἀπείρως, ἵνα δόξωσι παρεκβάλλειν τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου βιβλία, φημὶ δὲ Ἰωάννου τό τε Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν, τάχα τε καὶ τὰς Ἐπιστολάς· Συνᾴδουσι γὰρ καὶ αὗται τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει. . . . p. 457. Ἀλλὰ οὗτοι, μὴ δεξάμενοι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀνακρίνονται μὲν πνευματικῶς, μὴ νοοῦντες τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ κατὰ τὸν λόγον βουλόμενοι λέγειν, καὶ οὐκ εἰδότες τὰ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ χαρίσματα, ἅτινα ἀληθῶς καὶ εὐσταθῶς ἐν παρακολουθήσει, καὶ ἐῤῥωμένῳ νῷ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διηγήσατο· οἵ τε ἅγιοι προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι Ἀπόστολοι· ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης διὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χαρίσματος τοῦ ἁγίου μεταδέδωκε.

Ibid. (See before, p. 98, extract from Epiph. pp. 433, 434.)

Haeres. II. t. 2. *h.* 77. *p.* 1031. Καὶ ὅτι μὲν γέγραπται περὶ τῆς χιλιονταετηρίδος ταύτης, ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννου, καὶ ὅτι παρὰ πλείστοις (ἐστὶν) ἡ βίβλος πεπιστευμένη, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεοσεβέσι, δῆλον.

30. Hilary.[1]

In Psalm. I. p. 226 *E.* (In Lardner, Part II. p. 412.) Quod autem haec folia ligni hujus non inutilia sint, sed salutaria gentibus, sanctus Joannes in Apocalypsi testatur. (Apoc. xxii.)

De trinit. VI. p. 891 *D.* (In Lardner, ibid.) Electus ex publica Matthaeus in apostolum, et ex familiaritate Domini revelatione coelestium mysteriorum dignus Joannes.

31. Jerome.

Epist. II. ad Paulin. (See before, p. 21.)

De Vir. Ill. c. 9. (See before, p. 187.)

Ep. 129. *ad Dardan.* (Vallars. Vol. I. p. 965.) Quod si eam (sc. Epist. ad Hebraeos) Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas, nec Graecorum quidem Ecclesiae Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utraque

[1] Hilary Bishop of Poitiers about A.D. 354.

suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non, ut interdum de Apocryphis facere solent, . . . sed quasi Canonicis et Ecclesiasticis.

Adv. Jovinianum I. 26. (Vallars. Vol. II. p. 279.) Joannes, et Apostolus, et Evangelista, et Propheta. Apostolus, quia scripsit ad ecclesias ut magister: Evangelista, quia librum Evangelii condidit, . . . Propheta, vidit enim in Patmos insula, in qua fuerat a Domitiano principe ob Domini martyrium relegatus, Apocalypsim infinita futurorum mysteria continentem.

In Isaiam Lib. XVIII. Prooem. (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 767.) Et qua ratione intelligenda sit Apocalypsis Joannis, quam si juxta literam accipimus, judaizandum est, si spiritualiter, ut scripta est, disserimus, multorum veterum videbimur opinionibus contraire: Latinorum, Tertulliani, Victorini, Lactantii: Graecorum, ut caeteros praetermittam, Irenaei, tantum Lugdunensis episcopi faciam mentionem, adversus quem vir eloquentissimus Dionysius, Alexandrinae Ecclesiae Pontifex, elegantem scribit librum, irridens mille annorum fabulam, et auream atque gemmatam in terris Jerusalem, instaurationem Templi, hostiarum sanguinem, otium sabbathi, circumcisionis injuriam, nuptias, partus, liberorum educationem, epularum delicias, et cunctarum gentium servitutem: rursusque bella, exercitus ac triumphos, et superatorum neces, mortemque centenarii peccatoris. Cui duobus voluminibus respondit Apollinarius, quem non solum suae sectae homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte duntaxat plurima sequitur multitudo, ut praesaga mente jam cernam, quantorum in me rabies concitanda sit.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE copious extracts in this chapter show that the Apocalypse has had a varied measure of acceptance. At first, while men still expected an early return of Jesus Christ, the book seems to have been widely popular. This popularity lasted to the end of the second century. Hermas imitated it; Papias quoted it as inspired and trustworthy; Justin has from it his only citation of a New Testament book by name. And it appears that he not only quoted but expounded it, as also did Irenaeus. On the other side we must note its absence from the Peshito. The Alogi (see below—Heretics), who opposed all the Johannine writings, objected to this book, as to the others.

In the third century, although Origen and Hippolytus ascribed it to the Apostle John, opposition grew formidable. Caius, a "Roman Presbyter," about whom little is certainly known, ascribed an apocalyptic book to Cerinthus; and his reference is perplexing, as he apparently found in the book a description of a very carnal reign of the Saints in Jerusalem. On this account Hug and others have denied that his reference is to the Johannine Apocalypse. But no other book is known to which the reference can apply; and besides, it is just such an exaggerated description as would originate in keen controversy. In the latter part of the century Dionysius of Alexandria, the pupil and successor of Origen, prepared a formidable indictment to which all subsequent objectors have recourse for arguments. The headings of paragraphs in our text give a summary of his argument. There is good reason to believe that in the case of Dionysius, as certainly in that of Eusebius, it was dislike of millenarian views which led to depreciation of the Apocalypse.

From the days of Jerome, who accepted the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John, and expressly based his opinion on the testimonies of the ancients, there was little controversy regarding it in the Western Church until the Reformation. In the Eastern Church—from the rejection by Cyril of Jerusalem A.D. 386—there was considerable discussion; some doubting the canonicity of the book, some doubting that it was by John the son of Zebedee.

At the Reformation, Erasmus expressed his doubts of the authorship; Zwinglius rejected the book; Luther cast it off with contumely; Calvin used it, but did not comment upon it. At that time the chief controversy in Europe was upon the central doctrine of Justification, and the Apocalypse did not occupy a prominent position. But at a later date, when the controversy became ecclesiastical rather than doctrinal, each side, Protestant and Roman Catholic, interpreted it as a prophecy of the downfall of the other; and it was universally accepted as canonical. Bossuet and Vitringa are leading representatives of the two divisions of Western Christendom. Bengel's system of interpretation has been much followed.

During the 19th century there has been a keen controversy both as to the canonicity and as to the authorship of the book. Here, again, theological convictions have had no little share in deciding the side taken by critics. Its genuineness is maintained, and—if we may use the word—its canonicity, by those who are usually found as opponents of such claims. Those who ascribe a late date to the Gospels—especially to the Fourth Gospel—generally give the Apocalypse an early date, and claim the Apostle as its author, using its language and style as an argument against the idea of the Gospel being written by the same Apostle. In this way the views of the Tübingen school as to the first form of Jewish Christianity lead them to uphold the canonicity of this book, though denying to almost all the rest of the New Testament an Apostolic origin.

But even apart from questions of canonicity there is great division of opinion as to the authorship. The scraps of Papias have been as fruitful of works upon the two Johns as in works upon the original of Matthew's Gospel, or upon the "order" of Mark. Dionysius, though in a very diffident manner (see p. 349), took refuge in the supposition that Presbyter John was the author. But against this Irenaeus is decided. Moreover, if Irenaeus (p. 54 &c.) and Arethas (p. 338) be right, Papias, as a "hearer of John," is an ultimate authority, and Papias's testimony seems to be distinct; so that the authorship by the son of Zebedee is established. But the argument on the other side is that Irenaeus or Papias, or both, must have been mistaken. (See on "Aretas" Prof. W. P. Dickson's article in Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography.) For Presbyter John as the author we have Credner, Bleek, Ewald, De Wette, Lücke (ultimately), Düsterdieck and Keim. For the Apostle John, Eichhorn, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, Hofmann, Gebhardt and Krenkel. For John Mark, Hitzig and Weisse.

PART II.

TESTIMONIES OF HEATHEN.

II.

TESTIMONIES OF HEATHEN.[1]

1. Tacitus (A.D. 61 to about A.D. 120).

Ann. XV. 44. Sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia quin jussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis poenis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat; repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Judaeam, originem ejus mali, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. Igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud perinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti sunt. Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contecti laniatu canum interirent aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur. Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et circense ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel curriculo insistens. Unde quamquam adversus sontes et novissima exempla meritos miseratio oriebatur, tanquam non utilitate publica sed in saevitiam unius absumerentur.

[1] The earliest testimonies quoted in the text do not refer directly to the books; but they show what was the condition of the Christian Church and how largely it bulked in the eye of a Pagan observer. The testimonies of the heathen writers must be taken in connection with the writings of the Christian Apologists, to throw light upon the state of the churches whose bond of cohesion was the faith embodied in the Christian books.

2. Martial (A.D. 60 to A.D. 100).

Lib. X. Epigr. 25:—

In matutina nuper spectatus arena
Mucius, imposuit qui sua membra focis,
Si patiens fortisque tibi durusque videtur,
Abderitanae pectora plebis habes.
Nam, cum dicatur, tunicâ praesente molestâ
Ure manum, plus est dicere: Non facio.[1]

3. Pliny's Letter asking Directions from Trajan.

C. PLINIUS TRAJANO IMPERATORI[1] (A.D. 111).

Solemne est mihi, domine, omnia de quibus dubito ad te referre, quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere vel ignorantiam instruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam: ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri, nec mediocriter haesitavi, sitne aliquod discrimen aetatum, an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant, detur paenitentiae venia, an ei qui omnino Christianus fuit desisse non prosit, nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini puniantur. Interim in iis qui ad me tamquam Christiani deferebantur hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos an essent Christiani: confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi supplicium minatus: perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecumque esset quod faterentur, pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem

[1] Martial. Juvenal also, Sat. VIII. 235, says: "*Ausi quod liceat tunicâ punire molestâ*" (see also Sat. I. 155). And Seneca, in his list of cruelties, mentions the blazing coat last, "*illam tunicam, alimentis ignium et illitam et intextam*" (Ep. 14), apparently as a climax. The words of Martial may be supposed to describe the hardihood of Christians as greater than that of Mucius.

[1] Pliny's Letters. Edition-Keil, Leipzic, 1870, p. 307. The chief value, for our purpose, of this letter and of the Emperor's reply is, to show how Asia was pervaded by Christianity, a few years after the death of the Apostle John. Pliny's language shows that the Pagan temples were deserted. If John survived in Ephesus till Trajan's reign began, there must have been in his last years a large Christian Church in the regions around him. The difficulty of forging a Gospel in his name, so as to get it accepted by all that Church, when for the first time published many years after his death, is enormous. See Introduction: "The Fourth Gospel." See on the number of copies of the Gospels circulated among Christians: Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. 28 (2nd Edition).

obstinationem debere puniri. Fuerunt alii similis amentiae, quos, quia cives Romani erant, adnotavi in urbem remittendos. Mox ipso tractatu, ut fieri solet, diffundente se crimine plures species inciderunt. Propositus est libellus sine auctore multorum nomina continens. Qui negabant esse se Christianos aut fuisse, cum praeeunte me deos appellarent et imagini tuae, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum adferri, ture ac vino supplicarent, praeterea male dicerent Christo, quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt re vera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi. Alii ab indice nominati esse se Christianos dixerunt et mox negaverunt; fuisse quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante triennium, quidam ante plures annos, non nemo etiam ante viginti. Hi quoque omnes et imaginem tuam deorumque simulacra venerati sunt et Christo male dixerunt. Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium; quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram. Quo magis necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis, quae ministrae dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quaerere. Nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam immodicam. Ideo dilata cognitione ad consulendum te decucurri. Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse. Certe satis constat prope jam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra sollemnia diu intermissa repeti pastumque venire victimarum, cujus adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile est opinari, quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit poenitentiae locus.

4. The Emperor's Reply to Pliny.

TRAJANUS PLINIO.

Actum quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in excutiendis causis eorum qui Christiani ad te delati fuerant secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid quod quasi certam formam habeat constitui potest. Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt, ita tamen ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est supplicando dis nostris, quamvis suspectus in praeteritum, veniam ex paenitentia impetret. Sine auctore vero propositi libelli in nullo crimine locum habere debent. Nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est.[2]

5. Suetonius[1] (A.D. 121).

Vit. Claud. c. 25. [Sc. Claudius] Judaeos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. (Acts xviii. 2; Rom. xvi.)

Nero c. 16. Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae et maleficae. (2 Tim. i. 8, 16; ii. 16-18.)

6. Hadrianus Minucio Fundano, about A.D. 130[1].

Accepi litteras ad me scriptas a decessore tuo Sereno Graniano, clarissimo viro: et non placet mihi relationem silentio

[2] Trajan's rescript means that, while Christians were not to be sought for, they were to be punished, simply because they were Christians, when accused and convicted of that crime. They might escape by recanting and sacrificing to Roman idols. The same principle regulates the answer of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 177) to the inquiry of the Governor of Lyons, if we are to trust the narrative preserved by Eusebius H. E. V. 1.

[1] Suetonius (who testifies in these passages to the banishment of Christians by Claudius, and to their persecution by Nero) elsewhere shows how great were the calamities which fell upon the people of Jerusalem in the reigns of Vespasian and Titus. See Sueton. Vespas. c. 4-8; Sueton. cc. 4, 5. In his life of Domitian, c. 12, he speaks of some Jews who sought to evade payment of the Jewish tax on the ground of not being Jews; and in this he probably refers to the Christians. See Lardner, Vol. III. p. 618, &c.

[1] For the Latin Text—of Rufinus—see Otto's Justin I. c. 68, and Proleg. p. XXXII. It appears as though Serenus Granianus (but his real name was Quintus Licinius Silvanus Granianus) had written to the Emperor shortly before leaving his office, so that Hadrian's reply was sent to his successor. That this rescript is genuine was doubted by Keim (1856), and his negative position has

praeterire, ne et innoxii perturbentur et calumniatoribus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio. Itaque si evidenter provinciales huic petitioni suae adesse valent adversum Christianos, ut pro tribunali eos in aliquo arguant, hoc eis exequi non prohibeo: precibus autem in hoc solis et adclamationibus uti eis non permitto. Etenim multo aequius est, si quis volet accusare, te cognoscere de objectis. Si quis igitur accusat et probat adversum leges quicquam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. Illud mehercule magnopere curabis, ut si quis calumniae gratia quemquam horum postulaverit reum, in hunc pro sui nequitia suppliciis severioribus vindices.

[The following is Eusebius's Greek version of the Imperial letter, from his Hist. Eccl. IV. 9.]

Μινουκίῳ Φουνδανῷ. Ἐπιστολὴν ἐδεξάμην γραφεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ Σερεννίου Γρανιανοῦ, λαμπροτάτου ἀνδρὸς, ὄντινα σὺ διεδέξω. Οὐ δοκεῖ μοι οὖν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀζήτητον καταλιπεῖν, ἵνα μήτε οἱ ἄνθρωποι ταράττωνται, καὶ τοῖς συκοφάνταις χορηγία κακουργίας παρασχεθῇ. Εἰ οὖν σαφῶς εἰς ταύτην τὴν ἀξίωσιν οἱ ἐπαρχιῶται δύνανται διϊσχυρίζεσθαι κατὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὡς

been adopted by Baur (Ch. Hist. Part V), Hilgenf. (Einl. p. 169), Overbeck (Studien zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche, 1875), Aubé (Les Persecutions de l'Église, 1875) and others. Keim also (1878) returned to the charge in his "Aus dem Urchristenthum" p. 181. See defences in Wieseler's "Die Christenverfolgungen der Caesaren" 1878 (p. 18), and in Renan's "L'Église chretienne" 1879 (p. 32). Eusebius says that Serenus Granianus had written that it seemed to him unjust that Christians should be put to death because of popular clamour, and without legal trial and conviction of crime; and that Hadrian's reply was to the effect that no man should be put to death without a formal trial and conviction. His text bears out his summary. But the question is whether this is consistent with history. Or to put it somewhat differently: Was it still enough to prove that a man was a Christian, or must a definite crime be proved against him? Those who doubt the letters ascribed to Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius (for whose long and obviously forged "Letter to The Senate" see Otto's Justin p. 246), all of them increasingly favourable to Christians, believe that Trajan's edict in his letter to Pliny was still in force. Their strong point is that Justin's Apology and the stories of the Martyrs shew that Christians —simply as such—were in danger of death. If those merciful provisions in the disputed Imperial edicts had existed, Christians would not have needed to make their constant demand to be tried for crimes and not merely on account of their creed. Marcus Aurelius in his letter respecting the Christians in Gaul (Eus. H. E. V. 1. 42) substantially repeats Trajan's instructions. If that account in Eusebius state correctly what the Emperor said, it is inconceivable that the Antonines wrote the almost Christian letters ascribed to them. But Hadrian's letter may still be genuine, inasmuch as it only stipulates for explicit accusation, and does not define what would be conduct "against the laws."

καὶ πρὸ βήματος ἀποκρίνσαθαι, ἐπὶ τοῦτο μόνον τραπῶσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀξιώσεσιν, οὐδὲ μόναις βοαῖς. Πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον προσῆκεν, εἴ τις κατηγορεῖν βούλοιτο, τοῦτό σε διαγινώσκειν. Εἴ τις οὖν κατηγορεῖ καὶ δείκνυσί τι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους πράττοντας, οὕτως ὅριζε κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος· ὡς μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα εἴ τις συκοφαντίας χάριν τοῦτο προτείνοι, διαλάμβανε ὑπὲρ τῆς δεινότητος, καὶ φρόντιζε ὅπως ἂν ἐκδικήσειας.

7. Letter of Hadrian to Servianus.[1]

FLAVII VOPISCI SYRACUSII "SATURNINUS." A.D. 129.

C. II.[2] Hadrianus Augustus Serviano Consuli Salutem. Aegyptum, quam mihi laudabas, Serviane carissime, totam didici levem pendulam et ad omnia famae momenta volitantem. Illic qui Serapem colunt Christiani sunt et devoti sunt Serapi qui se Christi Episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic Archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum Presbyter, non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille Patriarcha cum Aegyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum. Genus hominum seditiosissimum vanissimum injuriosissimum: civitas opulenta dives fecunda, in qua nemo vivat otiosus. Alii vitrum conflant, ab aliis charta conficitur: alii linifiones, omnes certe cujuscumque artis et videntur et habentur. Podagrosi quod agant habent; habent caeci quod faciant. Ne chiragrici quidem apud eos otiosi vivunt. Unus illis Deus nullus [al. nummus] est. Hunc Christiani, hunc Judaei, hunc omnes venerantur et gentes. Et utinam melius esset morata civitas, digna profecto quae pro sui profunditate, quae pro sui magnitudine totius Aegypti teneat principatum. &c.

[1] Servianus or Severianus, Hadrian's brother-in-law, was consul A.D. 129, the year that Antinous was drowned. It is supposed that Hadrian was angry because the Christians would not worship his favourite. The letter is preserved by Flavius Vopiscus in his life of Saturninus (about A.D. 300).

[2] Scriptores Historiae Augustae ab Hadriano ad Numerianum. Berolini, 1863.

8. Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸ Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας.[1] (A.D. 148?)

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Τίτος Αἴλιος Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντωνῖνος Σεβαστὸς Εὐσεβὴς, Ἀρχιερεὺς Μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ κα', ὕπατος τὸ δ', Πατὴρ Πατρίδος, τῷ Κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας χαίρειν. Ἐγὼ ᾤμην ὅτι καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμελεῖς ἔσεσθαι μὴ λανθάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους. Πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκείνους κολάσοιεν, εἴπερ δύναιντο, τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοῖς προσκυνεῖν. Οἷς ταραχὴν ὑμεῖς ἐμβάλλετε, καὶ τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν, ἥπερ ἔχουσιν, ὡς ἀθέων κατηγορεῖτε, καὶ ἕτερά τινα ἐμβάλλετε, ἅτινα οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀποδεῖξαι. Εἴη δ' ἂν ἐκείνοις χρήσιμον τὸ δοκεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ κατηγορουμένῳ τεθνάναι· καὶ νικῶσιν ὑμᾶς προϊέμενοι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς, ἥπερ πειθόμενοι οἷς ἀξιοῦτε πράσσειν αὐτούς. Περὶ δὲ τῶν σεισμῶν τῶν γεγονότων καὶ τῶν γιγνομένων οὐκ εἰκὸς ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀθυμοῦντας, ὅταπερ ὦσι, παραβάλλοντας τὰ ὑμέτερα πρὸς τὰ ἐκείνων, ὅτι εὐπαρρησιαστότεροι ὑμῶν γίνονται πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὲν ἀγνοεῖν δοκεῖτε παρ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον τοὺς θεοὺς, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀμελεῖτε, θρησκείαν δὲ τὴν περὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἐπίστασθε. Ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς θρησκεύοντας ἐζηλώκατε, καὶ διώκετε ἕως θανάτου. Ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν περὶ τὰς ἐπαρχίας ἡγεμόνων τῷ θειοτάτῳ μου πατρὶ ἔγραψαν· οἷς καὶ ἀντέγραψε μηδὲν ὀχλεῖν τοῖς τοιούτοις, εἰ μὴ φαίνοιντό τι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Ῥωμαίων ἐγχειροῦντες. Καὶ ἐμοὶ δὲ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων πολλοὶ ἐσήμαναν· οἷς δὴ καὶ ἀντέγραψα, τῇ τοῦ πατρός μου κατακολουθῶν γνώμῃ. Εἰ δέ τις ἔχει πρός τινα τῶν τοιούτων πρᾶγμα καταφέρειν ὡς τοιούτου, ἐκεῖνος ὁ καταφερόμενος ἀπολελύσθω τοῦ ἐγκλήματος, κἂν φαίνηται τοιοῦτος ὤν, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ καταφέρων ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ δίκῃ.

[1] This letter is preserved at the end of Justin's second Apology, but probably not by Justin himself. Compare the text in Eus. H. E. IV. 13, and especially the superscription which professes to be from Marcus Aurelius. This inconsistency in the authorities is one of many grounds for doubting the whole production. Our text is from Otto's Justin, I p. 244. Antoninus Pius did write in favour of Christians to various cities, if Melito is to be trusted. See Melito in Eus. H. E. IV. 26.

9. Lucian (A.D. 176).[1]

De Morte Peregrini, c. 11. Ὅτεπερ καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐξέμαθε περὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ γραμματεῦσιν αὐτῶν ξυγγενόμενος. Καὶ τί γάρ; ἐν βραχεῖ παῖδας αὐτοὺς ἀπέφηνε· προφήτης καὶ θιασάρχης καὶ ξυναγωγεὺς καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὤν· καὶ τῶν βίβλων τὰς μὲν ἐξηγεῖτο καὶ διεσάφει, πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυνέγραφε, καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνοι ἡγοῦντο καὶ νομοθέτῃ ἐχρῶντο καὶ προστάτην ἐπέγραφον· τὸν μέγαν γοῦν ἐκεῖνον ἔτι σέβουσι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα, ὅτι καινὴν ταύτην τελετὴν εἰσήγαγεν ἐς τὸν βίον.

Τότε δὴ καὶ συλληφθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ Πρωτεὺς ἐνέπεσεν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ οὐ μικρὸν αὐτῷ ἀξίωμα περιεποίησε πρὸς τὸν ἐξῆς βίον καὶ τὴν τερατείαν καὶ δοξοκοπίαν ὧν ἐρῶν ἐτύγχανεν. Ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν ἐδέδετο, οἱ Χριστιανοὶ συμφορὰν ποιούμενοι τὸ πρᾶγμα πάντα ἐκίνουν ἐξαρπάσαι πειρώμενοι αὐτόν. Εἶτ' ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἦν ἀδύνατον, ἥ γε ἄλλη θεραπεία πᾶσα οὐ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ σὺν σπουδῇ ἐγίγνετο· καὶ ἕωθεν μὲν εὐθὺς ἦν ὁρᾶν παρὰ τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ περιμένοντα γραΐδια χήρας τινὰς καὶ παιδία ὀρφανά, οἱ δὲ ἐν τέλει αὐτῶν καὶ συνεκάθευδον ἔνδον μετ' αὐτοῦ διαφθείροντες τοὺς θεσμοφύλακας· εἶτα δεῖπνα ποικίλα εἰσεκομίζετο καὶ λόγοι ἱεροὶ ἐλέγοντο καὶ ὁ βέλτιστος Περεγρῖνος — ἔτι γὰρ τοῦτο ἐκαλεῖτο — καινὸς Σωκράτης ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὠνομάζετο. Καὶ μὴν κἀκ τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ πόλεων ἐστὶν ὧν ἦκόν τινες, τῶν Χριστιανῶν στελλόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, βοηθήσοντες καὶ ξυναγορεύσοντες καὶ παραμυθησόμενοι τὸν ἄνδρα. Ἀμήχανον δέ τι τὸ τάχος ἐπιδείκνυνται, ἐπειδάν τι τοιοῦτον γένηται δημόσιον· ἐν βραχεῖ γὰρ, ἀφειδοῦσι πάντων. Καὶ δὴ καὶ τῷ Περεγρίνῳ πολλὰ τότε ἦκε χρήματα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ προφάσει τῶν δεσμῶν καὶ πρόσοδον οὐ μικρὰν ταύτην ἐποιήσατο· πεπείκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι ἔσεσθαι

[1] Lucian, a native of Samosata in Syria, born under Hadrian, flourished under the two Antonines. He had an official post in Egypt. He wrote regarding Peregrinus, who burnt himself after the Olympic Games, A.D. 165. The passage quoted in the text is intended to ridicule the Christians, and is specially parallel with Ignatius: see Zahn's 'Ignatius,' p. 327. For many curious passages in support of a theory that this and many other works were forged a few hundred years ago, see Cotterill's 'Peregrinus Proteus' (Edin. 1879).

καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον, παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἑκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδιδόασιν οἱ πολλοί· ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος ἔπεισεν αὐτοὺς ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πάντες εἶεν ἀλλήλων, ἐπειδὰν ἅπαξ παραβάντες θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσονται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιῶσι. Καταφρονοῦσιν οὖν ἁπάντων ἐξ ἴσης καὶ κοινὰ ἡγοῦνται ἄνευ τινὸς ἀκριβοῦς πίστεως τὰ τοιαῦτα παραδεξάμενοι. Ἦν τοίνυν παρέλθῃ τις εἰς αὐτοὺς γόης καὶ τεχνίτης ἄνθρωπος καὶ πράγμασι χρῆσθαι δυνάμενος, αὐτίκα μάλα πλούσιος ἐν βραχεῖ ἐγένετο ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις ἐγχανών.

10. Celsus.[1]

I. Celsus's book. The title and method.

Origen c. Celsum, I. 40. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 733.) Ἐξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, τάχα δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Εὐαγγε-

[1] Celsus wrote a book entitled λόγος ἀληθής, which appears to have been an able assault upon Christianity from a philosophical and historical point of view. From various indications in the book, especially from the references to the state of the heathen world and to the persecution of Christians, the date may be fixed at about A.D. 178. Celsus refers to the Gospel narrative so fully and so frequently, that it is only necessary to give in our text some specimens of his mode of proceeding, and an indication of his acquaintance with each of the four canonical Gospels. He used Matthew—and Matthew in its present form (on this see Keim's Celsus, p. 228)—as his chief authority, but he knew the others, and quoted each of them. There are beyond question references to John. The incidents noticed by Celsus are (with at most one or two exceptions) from our Gospels. He refers to the Sibyl, saying that her writings are used and interpolated by Christians (V. 61; VII. 53); to the mystic symbols of the Ophites (VI. 25); and to Gnostic sects and writings (V. 54; V. 62; VIII. 15). He does not refer to any Christian writer of note, nor to any extra-canonical Christian work (unless we regard Enoch (V. 54) and the Dialogue of Papiscus and Jason (IV. 52) as exceptions). His references to the Epistles, though clear, are few. He seems to have set himself to study Christianity at its source; and he constructed an elaborate, keen, and able polemical treatise, anticipating most of the objections to the Gospels which are to be found in writers even of our own day. His analysis of the accounts of the Resurrection, and his criticism of the Discourses of Jesus, may be cited as examples of his acuteness. His inability to appreciate, or even to understand, the moral beauty of the life of Jesus Christ, shows how much lower was his own moral than his intellectual tone. Origen says that he was an Epicurean: he seems to have been a friend of Lucian; and, like his friend, he opposed Christianity in a hard way.

The work of Celsus has been compiled in Greek from Origen by C. R. Jachmann (1836), and Keim (1873) collected the passages and translated them into German with copious dissertations on the age and philosophy of the author. Lardner's Analysis is more intelligible, though less extended, than Keim's.

λίων, λαβὼν τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐπιπτάσης τῷ Σωτῆρι βαπτιζομένῳ παρὰ τοῦ Ἰωάννου περιστερᾶς, διαβάλλειν βούλεται ὡς πλάσμα τὸ εἰρημένον. Διασύρας δὲ, ὡς ᾤετο, τὴν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ παρθένου γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα ἡμῶν ἱστορίαν, οὐ τὰ ἑξῆς τῇ τάξει ἐκτίθεται· ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ἔχει τεταγμένον θυμὸς καὶ ἔχθρα. Ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐπελθὸν οἱ ὀργιζόμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐχθραίζοντες κακηγοροῦσιν οὓς μισοῦσι, μὴ ἐπιτρεπόμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ πάθους τεθεωρημένως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν λέγειν τὰς κατηγορίας. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν τάξιν ἐτήρει, λαβὼν ἂν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ προθέμενος, τῆς πρώτης ἂν ἱστορίας κατειπὼν, ἑξῆς ἐπὶ τὴν δευτέραν παρεγίνετο, καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ τὰς λοιπάς. Νυνὶ δὲ, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν, ὃ πάντ' εἰδέναι ἐπαγγειλάμενος Κέλσος τὰ ἡμέτερα, κατηγορεῖ τοῦ παρὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι φανέντος Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς· εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο διαβάλλει τὸ προφητεύεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιδημίαν· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατρέχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἑξῆς τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀναγεγραμμένον, τὸ περὶ τοῦ ἀστέρος διήγημα, καὶ τῶν ἐληλυθότων ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μάγων προσκυνῆσαι τῷ παιδίῳ. Πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιτηρῶν εὕρῃς συγκεχυμένως τῷ Κέλσῳ εἰρημένα δι' ὅλης τῆς βίβλου· ἵνα καὶ διὰ τούτου ὑπὸ τῶν τάξιν ἐπισταμένων τηρεῖν καὶ ζητεῖν, ἐλεγχθῇ μετὰ πολλῆς θρασύτητος καὶ ἀλαζονείας ἐπιγράψας Ἀληθῆ Λόγον τὴν βίβλον αὐτοῦ, ὅπερ τῶν ἐλλογίμων φιλοσόφων οὐδεὶς ἐποίησεν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πλάτων φησὶν, οὐ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντα εἶναι τὸ διϊσχυρίζεσθαι περὶ τῶν τοιῶνδε καὶ ἀδηλοτέρων· ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος πολλαχοῦ ἐκθέμενος τὰ κινήσαντα αὐτὸν, ἀναπέμπει ἡμᾶς ἐφ' οὓς ἂν εὕροιμεν κρεῖττον αὐτοῦ ἐροῦντας. Οὗτος οὖν ὁ καὶ τούτων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφώτερος, ἀκολούθως τῷ φάσκειν πάντ' εἰδέναι, Ἀληθῆ Λόγον ἐπέγραψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ βιβλίον.

II. THE GOSPELS AS A WHOLE.

Origen c. Celsum, II. 13. *Μετὰ ταῦτά φησιν ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος, ὅτι "πολλὰ ἔχων λέγειν περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν γενομένων καὶ ἀληθῆ, καὶ οὐ παραπλήσια τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γραφεῖσιν, ἑκὼν ἐκεῖνα παραλείπω."*

Ibid. II. 15. *Φησὶ δὲ ὁ Κέλσος, ὅτι "καὶ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐπὶ πράγματι περιφανεῖ μηδὲν ἔχοντες ἐπισκήψασθαι, τοῦτο ἐπενόησαν, τὸ λέγειν αὐτὸν πάντα προεγνωκέναι."*

Ibid. II. 26. Ἔτι δὲ λέγει ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος πρὸς τοὺς Ἰησοῦ μαθητὰς ὡς πλασαμένους ταῦτα, ὅτι "οὐδὲ ψευδόμενοι τὰ πλάσματα ὑμῶν πιθανῶς ἐπικαλύψαι ἠδυνήθητε."

Ibid. II. 27. Μετὰ ταῦτά τινας τῶν πιστευόντων φησὶν "ὡς ἐκ μέθης ἥκοντας εἰς τὸ ἐφεστάναι αὐτοῖς, μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τριχῆ καὶ τετραχῆ καὶ πολλαχῆ, καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀρνεῖσθαι."

Ibid. II. 74. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑμῖν ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων συγγραμμάτων ἐφ' οἷς οὐδενὸς ἄλλου μάρτυρος χρῄζομεν, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς περιπίπτετε.[2]

Ibid. V. 56. Εἶτα ἐξῆς, τὰ ἄμικτα καὶ ἀνόμοια μιγνὺς καὶ ἐξομοιῶν ἀλλήλοις, ἐπιφέρει τῷ περὶ τῶν (ὡς φησι) καταβεβηκότων ἑξήκοντα ἢ ἑβδομήκοντα ἀγγέλων λόγῳ πηγὰς Θερμῶν κατὰ αὐτὸν δακρυσάντων, ὅτι καὶ "πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τάφον ἱστόρηνται ἐληλυθέναι ὑπό τινων μὲν ἄγγελοι δύο, ὑπό τινων δὲ εἷς." Οὐκ, οἶμαι, τηρήσας Ματθαῖον μὲν καὶ Μάρκον ἕνα ἱστορηκέναι, Λουκᾶν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην δύο· ἅπερ οὐκ ἦν ἐναντία. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀναγράψαντες ἕνα, τὸν ἀποκυλίσαντα τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου τοῦτόν φασιν εἶναι· οἱ δὲ τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἐπιστάντας ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ ταῖς γενομέναις ἐπὶ μνημεῖον γυναιξὶν, ἢ τοὺς θεωρηθέντας ἔνδον ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους.

III. GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

Origen c. Celsum, I. 28. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ προσωποποιεῖ, τρόπον τινὰ μιμησάμενος ἐν ῥήτορος παιδίον εἰσαγόμενον, καὶ εἰσάγει Ἰουδαῖον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντά τινα μειρακιωδῶς, καὶ οὐδὲν φιλοσόφου πολιᾶς ἄξιον· φέρε κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ ταῦτα ἐξετάσαντες ἐξελέγξωμεν, ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ ἁρμόζον πάντῃ τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ πρόσωπον ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις τετήρηκε. Μετὰ ταῦτα προσωποποιεῖ Ἰουδαῖον αὐτῷ διαλεγόμενον τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐλέγχοντα αὐτὸν περὶ πολλῶν μὲν, ὡς οἴεται· πρῶτον δὲ, ὡς πλασαμένου αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γένεσιν· ὀνειδίζει δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπὶ

[2] These are the words Celsus puts into the mouth of the Jewish opponent of Christianity; and they show that Christians regarded their sacred books as Jews regarded theirs. (Comp. John v. 39, 46.) See below quotation from II. 49, καθὰ καὶ ὑμεῖς συγγεγράφατε. Origen in reply claims to have convicted Celsus of having put much nonsense (πολλὰ πεφλυάρηται) into the mouth of the "Jew" which he did not get from the writings of the Gospels. This must refer to comments, not to statements, for the facts are all from the Gospels. See an exception below, under No. VI., "Apocryphal Narratives."

τῷ ἐκ κώμης αὐτὸν γεγονέναι Ἰουδαϊκῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἐγχωρίου καὶ πενιχρᾶς, καὶ χερνήτιδος. Φησὶ δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ γήμαντος, τέκτονος τὴν τέχνην ὄντος, ἐξεῶσθαι, ἐλεγχθεῖσαν ὡς μεμοιχευμένην. Εἶτα λέγει, ὡς ἐκβληθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, καὶ πλανωμένη ἀτίμως σκότιον ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ ὅτι οὗτος διὰ πενίαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον μισθαρνήσας· κἀκεῖ δυνάμεών τινων πειραθεὶς, ἐφ' αἷς Αἰγύπτιοι σεμνύνονται, ἐπανῆλθεν, ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσι μέγα φρονῶν, καὶ δι' αὐτὰς θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀνηγόρευσε. (Mat. ii. 2.)

Ibid. I. 38. Ἔτι δὲ λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς γεγραμμένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίῳ ἱστορίας περὶ τοῦ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀποδεδημηκέναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τοῖς μὲν παραδόξοις εἰς τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν, οὔθ' ὅτι ἄγγελος τοῦτο ἔχρησεν, οὔτε εἴ τι ἠνίσσετο ὁ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐπιδημῶν· ἀνέπλασε δέ τι ἕτερον, συγκαταθέμενος μέν πως ταῖς παραδόξοις δυνάμεσιν, ἃς Ἰησοῦς ἐποίησεν, ἐν αἷς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἔπεισεν ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ ὡς Χριστῷ· διαβάλλειν δ' αὐτὰς βουλόμενος ὡς ἀπὸ μαγείας καὶ οὐ θείᾳ δυνάμει γεγενημένας· φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν σκότιον τραφέντα μισθαρνήσαντα εἰς Αἴγυπτον δυνάμεών τινων πειραθέντα, ἐκεῖθεν ἐπανελθεῖν, θεὸν δι' ἐκείνας τὰς δυνάμεις ἑαυτὸν ἀναγορεύοντα. (Mat. ii. 13.)

Ibid. I. 58. Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος ἀντὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ Μάγων Χαλδαίους φησὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λελέχθαι κινηθέντας ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ ἐληλυθέναι προσκυνήσοντας αὐτὸν ἔτι νήπιον ὡς θεόν· καὶ Ἡρώδῃ τῷ τετράρχῃ τοῦτο δεδηλωκέναι· τὸν δὲ πέμψαντα, ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ γεγενημένους, οἰόμενον καὶ τοῦτον ἀνελεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς· μή πως, τὸν αὐτάρκη ἐπιβιώσας χρόνον βασιλεύσῃ. Ὅρα οὖν ἐν τούτῳ τὸ παράκουσμα τοῦ μὴ διακρίνοντος Μάγους Χαλδαίων, μηδὲ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας διαφόρους οὔσας αὐτῶν θεωρήσαντος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καταψευσαμένου τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς γραφῆς. Οὐκ οἶδα δ' ὅπως καὶ τὸ κινῆσαν τοὺς Μάγους σεσιώπηκε, καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτὸ εἶναι ἀστέρα ὀφθέντα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον. (Mat. ii.)

Ibid. I. 62. Μετὰ ταῦτα δ' ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιστάμενος δέκα εἶπεν ἢ ἕνδεκά τινας ἐξαρτησάμενον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑαυτῷ ἐπιῤῥήτους ἀνθρώπους, τελώνας καὶ ναύτας τοὺς πονηροτάτους, μετὰ τούτων τῇδε κἀκεῖσε αὐτὸν ἀποδεδρα-

κέναι αἰσχρῶς καὶ γλίσχρως τροφὰς συνάγοντα. Φέρε καὶ περὶ τούτων, κατὰ τὸ δινατὸν, διαλάβωμεν· φανερὸν δέ ἐστι τοῖς ἐντιγχάνουσιν εὐαγγελικοῖς λόγοις, οὓς οὐδ' ἀνεγνωκέναι ὁ Κέλσος φαίνεται, ὅτι δώδεκα ἀποστόλους ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπελέξατο, κ.τ.λ. (Mat. x. 1, &c. Also Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13, &c.)

Ibid. I. 66. *Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις ἑξῆς ὁ Ἰουδαῖος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ λέγει· "τί δὲ καί σε νήπιον ἔτι ἐχρῆν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκκομίζεσθαι; μὴ ἀποσφαγῇς; Θεὸν γὰρ οὐκ εἰκὸς ἦν περὶ θανάτου δεδιέναι. Ἀλλ' ἄγγελος μὲν ἦκεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, κελεύων σοι καὶ τοῖς σοῖς οἰκείοις φεύγειν, μὴ ἐγκαταληφθέντες ἀποθάνητε. Φυλάσσειν δέ σε αὐτόθι ὁ δύο ἤδη διά σε πεπομφὼς ἀγγέλους, ὁ μέγας Θεὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν, οὐκ ἐδύνατο;"* (Mat. ii.)

Ibid. II. 24. *Ἑξῆς δὲ τούτοις θέλων παραστῆσαι ὅτι ἀλγεινὰ καὶ ἀνιαρὰ ἦν τὰ συμβάντα αὐτῷ· καὶ ὅτι οὐχ οἷόν τε ἦν βουληθέντα αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι εἶναι αὐτὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα, λέγει· "τί οὖν ποτνιᾶται, καὶ ὀδύρεται, καὶ τὸν τοῦ ὀλέθρου φόβον εὔχεται παραδραμεῖν, λέγων ὧδέ πως ὦ πάτερ εἰ δύναται τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο παρελθεῖν."* (Mat. xxvi. 39.) — *Καὶ ἐν τούτοις δὲ ὅρα τὸ τοῦ Κέλσου κακοῦργον . . . οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τὸ αὐτόθεν ἐμφαῖνον τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοψυχίαν, ἑξῆς τούτῳ ἀναγεγραμμένον παρατίθεται, οὕτως ἔχον· "πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ."* (Mat. xxvi. 39.)

Ibid. II. 45. *Πρόσχες δὲ καὶ τῷ ἐπιπολαίῳ τοῦ περὶ τῶν τότε μαθητῶν Ἰησοῦ λόγου ἐν ᾧ φησιν· "εἶτα οἱ μὲν τότε ζῶντι αὐτῷ συνόντες, καὶ τῆς φωνῆς ἐπακούοντες αὐτοῦ, καὶ διδασκάλῳ χρώμενοι, κολαζόμενον καὶ ἀποθνήσκοντα ὁρῶντες, οὔτε συναπέθανον, οὔτε ὑπεραπέθανον αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ κολάσεων καταφρονεῖν ἐπείσθησαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠρνήσαντο εἶναι μαθηταί· νῦν δὲ ὑμεῖς αὐτῷ συναποθνήσκετε."* (Mat. xxvi. 56.)

Ibid. VI. 16. *Μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν κατὰ τῶν πλουσίων ἀπόφασιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰπόντος, "εὐκοπώτερον κάμηλον εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,"* φησὶν *ἄντικρυς ἀπὸ Πλάτωνος εἰρῆσθαι, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παραφθείραντος τὸ Πλατωνικὸν, ἐν οἷς εἶπεν ὁ Πλάτων· ὅτι "ἀγαθὸν ὄντα διαφερόντως, καὶ πλούσιον εἶναι διαφερόντως, ἀδύνατον." Τίς δ' οὐκ ἂν, καὶ μετρίως ἐφιστάνειν τοῖς πράγμασι δυνάμενος, τὸν Κέλσον γελάσαι, οὐ τῶν πιστευόντων τῷ Ἰησοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν*

λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀκούων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις γεγεννημένος καὶ ἀνατεθραμμένος, καὶ Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος νομισθεὶς εἶναι υἱὸς, καὶ μηδὲ γράμματα μεμαθηκὼς, οὐ μόνον τὰ Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τὰ Ἑβραίων, ὅπερ καὶ αἱ φιλαλήθεις μαρτυροῦσι γραφαὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν, ἀνέγνω Πλάτωνα· καὶ ἀρεσθεὶς τῇ περὶ τῶν πλουσίων ἀποφαινομένῃ αὐτοῦ λέξει, ὡς "ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι διαφερόντως καὶ πλούσιον," παρέφθειρεν αὐτὴν, καὶ πεποίηκε τὸ, "εὐκοπώτερον κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ;" Εἰ δὲ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ μισεῖν καὶ ἀπεχθάνεσθαι ἐντυχὼν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις, φιλαλήθης ἦν ὁ Κέλσος, ἐπέστησεν, κ.τ.λ. (Mat. xix. 24; xiii. 55.)

IV. MARK AND LUKE.

Origen c. Celsum, I. 41. *Ἔστι δ᾽ ὁ Ἰουδαῖος αὐτῷ ἔτι ταῦτα λέγων, πρὸς ὃν ὁμολογοῦμεν εἶναι Κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν Ἰησοῦν· "λουομένῳ, φησὶ, σοὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ φάσμα ὄρνιθος ἐξ ἀέρος λέγεις ἐπιπτῆναι." Εἶτα πυνθανόμενος ὁ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ Ἰουδαῖός φησι· "τίς τοῦτο εἶδεν ἀξιόχρεως μάρτυς τὸ φάσμα; ἢ τίς ἤκουσεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φωνῆς εἰσποιούσης σε υἱὸν τῷ Θεῷ, πλὴν ὅτι σὺ φῂς, καί τινα ἕνα ἐπάγῃ τῶν μετά σου κεκολασμένων;"* (Mat. iii. 16; Mark i. 10; Luke iii. 22.)

Ibid. I. 63. *Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπιῤῥήτους εἶπεν ἀνθρώπους τελώνας καὶ ναύτας πονηροτάτους λέγων ὁ Κέλσος τοὺς ἀποστόλους Ἰησοῦ, καὶ περὶ τούτου φήσομεν· ὅτι ἔοικεν, ἵνα μὲν ἐγκαλέσῃ τῷ λόγῳ, πιστεύειν ὅπου θέλει τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, ἵνα δὲ τὴν ἐμφαινομένην θειότητα ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς βιβλίοις ἀπαγγελλομένην μὴ παραδέξηται, ἀπιστεῖν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις· δέον τὸ φιλάληθες ἰδόντα τῶν γραψάντων, ἐκ τῆς περὶ τῶν χειρόνων ἀναγραφῆς πιστεῦσαι καὶ περὶ τῶν θειοτέρων. Γέγραπται δὴ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ (ὅθεν ὁ Κέλσος λαβὼν τάχα εἶπεν εἶναι ἐπιῤῥήτους καὶ πονηροτάτους τοὺς ἀποστόλους) ὅτι ἐξελέξατο τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους Ἰησοῦς, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν ἀνομωτέρους. Καὶ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν φησι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁ Πέτρος· "ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, Κύριε."* (Luke v. 8.)

Ibid. II. 18. *Ἑξῆς δὲ τούτῳ καὶ ἄλλο εὐηθές φησιν ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος, ὅτι "πῶς, εἴπερ προεῖπε καὶ τὸν προδώσοντα καὶ τὸν ἀρνησόμενον, οὐκ ἂν ὡς θεὸν ἐφοβήθησαν, ὡς τὸν*

μὲν μὴ προδοῦναι ἔτι, τὸν δὲ μὴ ἀρνήσασθαι;" (Luke ix. 44; Mark ix. 31.)

Ibid. II. 32. *Ἐγκαλῶν δὲ τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ, τὰ μὲν καὶ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ζητούμενα, καὶ ὑπό τινων ὡς ἐγκλήματα προσαγόμενα τῇ διαφωνίᾳ τῶν γενεαλογιῶν, οὐδαμῶς ὠνόμασεν. Οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει ὁ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀλαζὼν Κέλσος καὶ ἐπαγγελλόμενος εἰδέναι πάντα τὰ Χριστιανῶν, φρονίμως ἐπαπορῆσαι τῇ γραφῇ. Φησὶ δὲ ἀπηυθαδῆσθαι τοὺς γενεαλογήσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου φύντος καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίοις βασιλέων τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Καὶ οἴεταί τι εἰσφέρειν γενναῖον, ὅτι "οὐκ ἂν ἡ τοῦ τέκτονος γυνὴ τηλικούτου γένους τυγχάνουσα ἠγνόει.*" (Luke iii.; Mat. i.)

Ibid. II. 48. *Καὶ νῦν δέ φησιν οἱονεὶ ἡμᾶς ἀποκρίνασθαι, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτ' ἐνομίσαμεν αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν Θεοῦ, "ἐπεὶ χωλοὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς ἐθεράπευσε." Προστίθησι δὲ καὶ τό· "ὡς ὑμεῖς φατε, ἀνίστη νεκρούς."* (Mat. xi. 5; Luke iv. 18.)

Ibid. II. 59. *Οἴεται δὲ τερατείαν εἶναι καὶ τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὸν σκότον, περὶ ὧν, κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν, ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω ἀπελογησάμεθα, παραθέμενοι τὸν Φλέγοντα, ἱστορήσαντα κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦ πάθους τοῦ Σωτῆρος τοιαῦτα ἀπηντηκέναι· "καὶ ὅτι ζῶν μὲν οὐκ ἐπήρκεσεν ἑαυτῷ, νεκρὸς δ' ἀνέστη· καὶ τὰ σημεῖα τῆς κολάσεως ἔδειξεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς ἦσαν πεπερονημέναι." . . . Εἶθ' ἑξῆς τούτοις εἰπὼν τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ὅτι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς κολάσεως ἔδειξεν ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ὡς ἦσαν πεπερονημέναι, πυνθάνεται, καὶ λέγει· "τίς τοῦτο εἶδε;" καὶ τὰ περὶ Μαρίας τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς διαβάλλων, ἀναγραφομένης ἑωρακέναι, εἶπε· "γυνὴ πάροιστρος, ὡς φατέ." Καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ μόνη αὕτη ἀναγέγραπται ἑωρακέναι ἀναστάντα τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοι· καὶ ταῦτα κακηγορῶν ὁ Κέλσου Ἰουδαῖός φησι, "καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος τῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς γοητείας.*" (John xx. 27; Mark xvi. 8.)

Ibid. II. 63. *Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Κέλσος, οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήτως τὰ γεγραμμένα κακολογῶν, φησὶν, ὅτι "ἐχρῆν, εἴπερ ὄντως θείαν δύναμιν ἐκφῆναι ἤθελεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐπηρεάσασι, καὶ τῷ καταδικάσαντι, καὶ ὅλως πᾶσιν ὀφθῆναι.*"

V. JOHN.

Origen c. Celsum, I. 50. *Καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως βουλόμενος καὶ ἑτέροις περιθεῖναι τὸ δύνασθαι ὑπονοεῖσθαι, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἦσαν οἱ*

προφητευθέντες, φησὶν, ὅτι "οἱ μὲν ἐνθουσιῶντες, οἱ δὲ ἀγείροντες, φασὶν ἥκειν ἄνωθεν υἱὸν Θεοῦ." (John iii. 31; viii. 23.)

Ibid. I. 67. *Μετὰ ταῦτά φησιν ὁ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος, ὡς φιλομαθής τις Ἕλλην, καὶ τὰ Ἑλλήνων πεπαιδευμένος, ὅτι "οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ μῦθοι Περσεῖ, καὶ Ἀμφίονι, καὶ Ἀιακῷ, καὶ Μίνωϊ θείαν σποράν νείμαντες, οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν· ὅμως ἐπέδειξαν ἑαυτῶν ἔργα μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ, ἀληθῶς τε ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα μὴ ἀπίθανοι δοκῶσι· σὺ δὲ δὴ τί καλὸν ἢ θαυμάσιον ἔργῳ ἢ λόγῳ πεποίηκας; ἡμῖν οὐδὲν ἐπεδείξω· καίτοι προκαλουμένων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ σε παρασχέσθαι τι ἐναργὲς γνώρισμα, ὡς εἷης ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς."* (John ii. 18; x. 24; Mat. xxi. 23.)

Ibid. I. 70. *Λέγει δ' ὅτι "οὐδὲ τοιαῦτα σιτεῖται σῶμα Θεοῦ·" ὡς ἔχων αὐτὸν παραστῆσαι ἀπὸ τῶν Εὐαγγελικῶν γραμμάτων σιτούμενον, καὶ ποῖα σιτούμενον. Ἀλλ' ἔστω, λεγέτω αὐτὸν βεβρωκέναι μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν τὸ πάσχα, οὐ μόνον εἰπόντα τό· "ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν·" ἀλλὰ καὶ βεβρωκότα. Λεγέτω δ' αὐτὸν καὶ διψήσαντα παρὰ τῇ πηγῇ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ πεπωκέναι, τί τοῦτο πρὸς τὰ περὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ὑφ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενα; Σαφῶς δὲ φαίνεται ἰχθύος μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν βεβρωκώς· κατὰ γὰρ ἡμᾶς σῶμα ἀνείληφεν, ὡς γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός. "Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ σῶμα," φησὶ, "Θεοῦ χρῆται τοιαύτῃ φωνῇ, οὐδὲ τοιᾷδε πειθοῖ."* (Luke xxii. 15; John iv. 6; xxi. 13.)

Ibid. II. 31. *Μετὰ ταῦτα Χριστιανοῖς ἐγκαλεῖ, "ὡς σοφιζομένοις ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι αὐτολόγον," καὶ οἴεταί γε κρατύνειν τὸ ἔγκλημα· ἐπεὶ "λόγον ἐπαγγελλόμενοι υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀποδείκνυμεν οὐ λόγον καθαρὸν καὶ ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἀτιμότατον ἀπαχθέντα ἀποτυμπανισθέντα.* (John i.)

Ibid. II. 36. *Εἶτά φησιν ὁ Κέλσος· "τί καὶ ἀνασκολοπιζομένου τοῦ σώματος ποῖος ἰχὼρ, οἷός περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν;"* (John xix. 34.)

Ibid. II. 49. *Ὁ δὲ Κέλσος, κοινοποιῆσαι βουλόμενος τὰ τεράστια τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις γοητείαν, φησὶν αὐταῖς λέξεσιν· Ὦ φῶς καὶ ἀλήθεια*[3]*, τῇ αὐτοῦ φωνῇ διαῤῥήδην ἐξαγορεύει, καθὰ καὶ ὑμεῖς συγγεγράφατε διότι παρέσονται ὑμῖν καὶ*

[3] The exclamation Ὦ φῶς καὶ ἀλήθεια is by some supposed to take up the leading words of John's Gospel—John i. 9, &c.

ἕτεροι δυνάμεσιν ὁμοίαις χρώμενοι κακοὶ καὶ γοήτες· καὶ σατανᾶν τινα τοιαῦτα παραμηχανώμενον ὀνομάζει.[4] (Mat. xxiv. 23, &c.)

VI. APOCRYPHAL NARRATIVES.

Origen c. Celsum, I. 28. (See before, p. 371.)

Ibid. I. 32. *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπανέλθωμεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου προσωποποιΐαν, ἐν ᾗ ἀναγέγραπται ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μήτηρ κύουσα ὡς ἐξωθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ μνηστευσαμένου αὐτὴν τέκτονος ἐλεχθεῖσα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ, καὶ τίκτουσα ἀπό τινος στρατιώτου Πανθήρα τοὔνομα· καὶ ἴδωμεν, εἰ μὴ τυφλῶς οἱ μυθοποιήσαντες τὴν μοιχείαν τῆς παρθένου καὶ τοῦ Πανθήρα, καὶ τὸν τέκτονα ἐξωσάμενον αὐτὴν, ταῦτα πάντα ἀνέπλασαν ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει τῆς παραδόξου ἀπὸ ἁγίου Πνεύματος συλλήψεως.*

VII. THE EPISTLES.[5]

Origen c. Celsum, I. 9. *Φησὶ δὲ "τινὰς μηδὲ βουλομένους διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν λόγον περὶ ὧν πιστεύουσι, χρῆσθαι τῷ, Μὴ ἐξέταζε, ἀλλὰ πίστευσον· καί· Ἡ πίστις σου σώσει σέ." Καί φησιν αὐτοὺς λέγειν· Κακὸν ἡ ἐν τῷ βίῳ σοφία, ἀγαθὸν δ' ἡ μωρία.* (1 Pet. iii. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 19.)

Ibid. V. 64. *Ἀλλ' οὗτος, ὁ πάντ' εἰδέναι ἐπαγγελλόμενος, καὶ τοιαῦτά φησι· "πάντων δέ" φησιν, "ἀκούσῃ τῶν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον διεστηκότων, καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ταῖς ἔρισιν αἴσχιστα διελεγχόντων, λεγόντων τὸ, ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ" τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ἔοικε μεμνημονευκέναι ὁ Κέλσος.* (Gal. vi. 14.)

Ibid. VI. 12. *Διὸ μεταβαίνωμεν ἐπ' ἄλλην Κέλσου κατηγορίαν, οὐδὲ τὰς λέξεις ἡμῶν εἰδότος, ἀλλ' ἐκ παρακουσματίων φήσαντος, ὅτι "φαμὲν τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις σοφίαν μωρίαν εἶναι παρὰ Θεῷ·" τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος, "ἡ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου μωρία παρὰ Θεῷ ἐστι"· καί φησιν ὁ Κέλσος, ὅτι "ἡ τούτου αἰτία καὶ πάλαι εἴρηται." Οἴεται δὲ αἰτίαν εἶναι τὸ βούλεσθαι ἡμᾶς διὰ*

[4] See before, Note on II. 74. Those references to the birth and childhood of Jesus are the only Apocryphal additions to the Evangelical record made by Celsus.

[5] Celsus, as dealing with the historical basis of Christianity and with the Person of its founder, did not study the Epistles: but he seems to have read them, or some of them.

τῆς λέξεως ταύτης τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους καὶ ἠλιθίους προσάγεσθαι μόνους. (1 Cor. iii. 19.)

Ibid. VI. 42. Ἑξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἀπὸ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ὁ Κέλσος τοιαῦτά φησι καθ' ἡμῶν, "σφάλλονται δὲ ἀσεβέστατα, ἅττα καὶ περὶ τήνδε τὴν μεγίστην ἄγνοιαν ὁμοίως ἀπὸ θείων αἰνιγμάτων πεπλανημένην, ποιοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ ἐναντίον τινὰ, διάβολόν τε καὶ γλώττῃ Ἑβραΐᾳ Σατανᾶν ὀνομάζοντες τὸν αὐτόν. Ἄλλως μὲν οὖν παντελῶς θνητὰ ταῦτα, καὶ οὐδ' ὅσια λέγειν, ὅτι δὴ ὁ μέγιστος Θεὸς, βουλόμενός τι ἀνθρώποις ὠφελῆσαι, τὸν ἀντιπράσσοντα ἔχει, καὶ ἀδυνατεῖ. Ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς ἄρα ἡττᾶται ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου· καὶ κολαζόμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, διδάσκει καὶ ἡμᾶς τῶν ὑπὸ τούτου κολάσεων καταφρονεῖν, παραγορεύων, ὡς ἄρα ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμοίως φανεὶς ἐπιδείξεται μεγάλα ἔργα καὶ θαυμαστὰ, σφετεριζόμενος τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξαν· οἷς οὐ χρῆναι προσέχειν βουληθέντας ἀποτρέπεσθαι ἐκεῖνον, ἀλλὰ μόνῳ πιστεύειν ἑαυτῷ. Ταῦτα μέν γέ ἐστιν ἄντικρυς ἀνθρώπου γόητος, ἐργολαβοῦντος καὶ προφυλαττομένου τοὺς ἀντιδοξοῦντάς τε καὶ ἀνταγείροντας." (2 Thess. ii. 4, &c.)

Ibid. VIII. 24. Ἴδωμεν δὲ οἷς χρῆται ὁ Κέλσος λόγοις, προτρέπων ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, καὶ τὰς δημοτελεῖς ἐν δημοτελέσιν ἑορταῖς θυσίας. Ἃ δὲ λέγει, τοιαῦτά ἐστιν, "εἰ μὲν οὐδὲν ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ εἴδωλα, τί δεινὸν κοινωνῆσαι τῆς πανθοινίας; εἰ δ' εἰσί τινες δαίμονες, δηλονότι καὶ οὗτοι τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσιν, οἷς καὶ πιστευτέον καὶ καλλιερητέον κατὰ νόμους καὶ προσευκτέον, ἵν' εὐμενεῖς ὦσι." Χρήσιμον δ' εἰς ταῦτα ὅλον τὸν περὶ εἰδωλοθύτων λόγον, εἰρημένον παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους Ἐπιστολῇ λαβεῖν εἰς χεῖρας καὶ σαφηνίσαι. (1 Cor. viii. 4-11.)

11. Porphyry.[1]

Eus. H. E. VI. 19. Τί δεῖ ταῦτα λέγειν, ὅτε καὶ ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Σικελίᾳ καταστὰς Πορφύριος, συγγράμματα καθ' ἡμῶν ἐνστη-

[1] Jerome, Ep. LXX. Ad Magnum Oratorem Romanum (Vallars. Vol. I. 425), says: "*Scripserunt contra nos Celsus atque Porphyrius: priori Origenes, alteri Methodius, Eusebius et Apollinarius fortissime responderunt. Quorum Origenes octo scripsit libros. Methodius usque ad decem millia procedit versuum. Eusebius et Apollinarius viginti quinque, et triginta volumina condiderunt.*" Porphyry was a native of Tyre, or, as some say, of Batanea (Bashan) in Syria, whence the name "Bataneotes."

σάμενος· καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τὰς θείας γραφὰς διαβάλλειν πεπειραμένος, τῶν τε εἰς αὐτὰς ἐξηγησαμένων μνημονεύσας, μηδὲν μηδαμῶς φαῦλον ἔγκλημα τοῖς δόγμασιν ἐπιβαλεῖν δυνηθείς, ἀπορίᾳ λόγων, ἐπὶ τὸ λοιδορεῖν τρέπεται, καὶ τοὺς ἐξηγητὰς διαβάλλειν, ὧν μάλιστα τὸν Ὠριγένην;

12. Celsus and Porphyry.

Chrysost. Homil. 6. *in Ep. I. ad Corinth.* (Tom. V. p. 58.) *Πῶς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐξετάθη πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης; Ἱκανοὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμῶν εἰρηκότες τὴν ἀρχαιότητα μαρτυρῆσαι τοῖς βιβλίοις, οἱ περὶ Κέλσον καὶ τὸν Βατανεώτην τὸν μετ' ἐκεῖνον· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοὺς συντεθεῖσαν ἀντέλεγον.*

He was a pupil of Origen, and flourished in the end of the third century. He wrote a treatise against Christianity in 15 Books. There are many references to him by Jerome in his Comment. on Galatians and elsewhere. He dwelt upon the inconsistencies in Scripture, on the dispute between Peter and Paul (Galat. ii.), and advanced other objections of the same kind. His friend Amelius might also be quoted as attesting the existence of the Gospel of John. See Eus. Praep. Evang. XI. 18. p. 539.

PART III.

TESTIMONIES OF HERETICS.

III.

TESTIMONIES OF HERETICS.

1. Simon Magus.[1]

Iren. Haer. B. I. 27. 4. (*Simon the first Heretic.*) Omnes, qui quoquo modo adulterant veritatem et praeconium ecclesiae laedunt, Simonis Samaritani Magi discipuli et successores sunt. (See Acts viii. 9.)

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VI. 9. *Οἰκητήριον δὲ λέγει εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον τὸν ἐξ αἱμάτων γεγεννημένον, καὶ κατοικεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπέραντον δύναμιν, ἣν ῥίζαν εἶναι τῶν ὅλων φησίν.* (John i. 13.)[2]

[1] Simon Magus was "the hero of the romance of heresy," and as such occupies a great part of the Clementine narratives. According to Irenaeus, B. I. 23, Hippol. VI. 9. 14, &c., he was a man of great power, the framer of a system the cardinal tenet of the cosmogony of which was the degradation of a thought of God (Ἔννοια), chained by the spirits she had created, until she appeared as a degraded woman. She had appeared in many female forms, among others as Helen of Troy, and as Helena she accompanied Simon in his wanderings. Simon himself, as the primal Manifestation of the supreme God, had come to set the captive Ἔννοια free (Iren. B. I. 23. 3). All the manifestations of God as Father, Son, and Spirit, were only modes or δυνάμεις of the same God. Simon was unlike other Gnostics in claiming for himself the supreme place and power. He was ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη, Acts viii. 10. Hippolytus bases his description of the system on the Scripture of the Simonians called Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη, which he regards as a genuine work of Simon. It may have originated with his successor Menander (see Milman, Hist. of Christianity II. 50). In the system of Simon the Holy Ghost is female. This suggests the similar teaching in the baptismal invocation in the Apocryphal "Acts of Thomas," "Come, O Mother of compassion; Come, O Mother who revealest hidden mysteries, that we may attain to the rest which is in the Eighth Mansion." So also in the 'Gospel of the Hebrews' (see below), the Holy Spirit is called the Mother of Christ. The peculiarity of Simon's system is its subordinating Christ to the Gnostic himself.

[2] It is not clear how far these words are Simon's, and how far Hippolytus's own. They are preceded by an exact quotation to which the preface is λέγων οὕτως.

Ibid. VI. 10. *Ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκκρίσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ διακρίσεως ἱκανῶς, φησὶν, εἴρηκεν ἡ γραφὴ, καὶ πρὸς διδασκαλίαν ἀρκεῖ τοῖς ἐξεικονισμένοις τὸ λεχθέν· ὅτι πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα σαρκὸς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου. Ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσε· τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* (1 Pet. i. 24, 25.)

Ibid. VI. 14. *Τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον· Ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν.* (1 Cor. xi. 32.)

Ibid. VI. 16. *Ἐγγὺς γάρ που, φησὶν, ἡ ἀξίνη παρὰ τὰς ῥίζας τοῦ δένδρου· πᾶν δένδρον, φησὶ, μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.* (Mat. iii. 10.)

Ibid. VI. 19. *Τὸ πρόβατον τὸ πεπλανημένον.* (Luke xv. 6.)[3]

(The following may be an echo.) *Ibid. VI.* 9. *Γέγονε μὲν γάρ φησιν ὁ καρπὸς ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην τεθῇ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον ἵνα παραδοθῇ τῷ πυρί.* (Mat. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17.)

2. Cerinthus.[1]

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 28. *p.* 113. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 383.) (Concerning the Cerinthians.) *Χρῶνται γὰρ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίῳ ἀπὸ μέρους, καὶ οὐχὶ ὅλῳ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν γενεαλογίαν*

[3] Compare Iren. B. I. 23. 2: *Hanc esse perditam ovem.* The reference is to Helena, the impersonate captive Ennoea of Simon's system.

[1] There is little known with certainty about Cerinthus. He is the traditional opponent of the Apostle John, and is regarded as a Judaeo-Christian Gnostic. The extracts in the text from Epiphanius are substantially confirmed by Hippol. VII. 33, and by Irenaeus, B. I. 26. 1; B. III. 11. 1; (B. III. 12. 7?). For some notice of his connection with the Apocalypse in tradition and in controversy see before, p. 343, "Caius." He is not mentioned by Justin, Clem. Alex., Tertullian, or Origen. He represented in Ephesus the Orientalism which regarded the unknown as the supreme source of all, and the material world as the work of inferior beings. He was the first noted man who confined Christ's redeeming work to enlightening the intellect. Ignorance, not perversity, becomes in this view the parent of sin. He professed to derive his knowledge from angelic revelation. There is every reason to accept the tradition which represents John as writing his Gospel to overthrow the errors of Cerinthus (Iren. B. III. 11. 1). Cerinthus, though he believed that the Aeon Christ descended upon the man Jesus at his Baptism, and ascended from Him before the crucifixion, believed also that the crucified Jesus rose from the dead (Iren. B. I. 26. 2). See Mansel's Gnosticism p. 115. The picturesqueness of the idea that Cerinthus, whom the Church regards as the chief enemy in the eye of the Fourth Evangelist, might be, notwithstanding, the author of the Gospel, has attracted M. Renan; but except that it is picturesque he has not much to suggest in support of it. (Renan, L'Eglise chrétienne, p. 53.)

τὴν ἔνσαρκον, καὶ ταύτην μαρτυρίαν φέρουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, πάλιν λέγοντες ὅτι Ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος. (Mat. x. 25.) *... Τὸν δὲ Παῦλον ἀθετοῦσι, διὰ τὸ μὴ πείθεσθαι τῇ περιτομῇ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκβάλλουσιν αὐτὸν, διὰ τὸ εἰρηκέναι· Ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε καὶ ὅτι Ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει.* (Gal. v. 4, 2.)

Ibid. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 138. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 429.) (Concerning the Ebionites.) *Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς, τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι δῆθεν παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας, βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗτοι δὲ ἄλλα τινὰ διανοοῦνται. Παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας, ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προείπομεν, λέγοντες ὅτι "Ἐγένετο," φησὶν, "ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως . . . ἦλθέ τις Ἰωάννης," κ.τ.λ.*[2]

3. Naassenes or Ophites.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 7. (Duncker, p. 142.) *Τοῦτον εἶναί φησιν ἀγαθὸν μόνον, καὶ περὶ τούτου λελέχθαι τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος*

[2] See before, p. 139, extracts from Epiphanius.

[1] Irenaeus names Ophites among those who came up like mushrooms (B. I. 29. 1), and regards them as fathers and mothers of the school of Valentinus (B. I. 31. 3), and as predecessors of Valentinus (B. II. Preface). So also Hippolytus (VI. 6) sets the Ophites down as progenitors of subsequent sects, and among these he even reckons Simon Magus and his followers. They seem therefore to belong to the first century. Hippolytus says they originally called themselves "Naassenes" from the Hebrew (נָחָשׁ a serpent) (V. 6), but subsequently "Gnostics," alleging that they alone had the gift of knowledge. He says that they used the Gospel according to the Egyptians (V. 7. p. 136), which described the changes of the soul. He also shows at great length, and with bewildering minuteness, that the Naassenes, who falsely ascribed the origin of their system to James the Lord's brother through Mariamne, are really indebted for it to the ancient "mysteries" of Egypt and Phrygia (V. 7). There were several subdivisions of the Ophite Heresies: Peratae, Cainites, Sethians, and Justinians. They reverenced the serpent of O. T. history, whose opposition to the Creator of the world won their respect. It is superfluous to say that they were struggling with the old and ever new difficulty of the origin of evil, and of the connection of human sin with the material framework of the human body. In some of them we may see also the deification of mere intellect, for the Serpent was regarded as the intellectual emancipator of enslaved or imperfect man. From Bythos or primal Light, the Father of all and the first man, went forth Ἔννοια which produced a Son, the second man. Below those was the Holy Spirit—a female; and from the union of Father and Son with the Spirit was produced the

λεγόμενον· Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mat. xix. 17; Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 10) ὃς ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ ὁσίους καὶ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτωλούς. (Mat. v. 45; compare Rom. i. 20-26.)

Ibid. c. 8. (p. 158.) Τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον· Τάφοι ἐστὲ κεκονιαμένοι, γέμοντες, φησὶν, ἔσωθεν ὀστέων νεκρῶν. (Mat. xxiii. 27.)

Ibid. Καὶ πάλιν, φησὶν, εἴρηκεν ὁ Σωτήρ· Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (Mat. vii. 21.)

Ibid. Καὶ πάλιν, φησὶν, εἴρηκεν· Οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν . . . ἡμεῖς δὲ, φησὶν, ἐσμὲν οἱ τελῶναι, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκε. (Mat. xxi. 31; 1 Cor. x. 11.)

Ibid. (p. 160.) Τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον· Πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται. (Mat. iii. 10; Luke iii. 9.)

Ibid. Τουτέστιν ὃ λέγει, φησί· Μὴ βάλητε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶ μηδὲ τοὺς μαργαρίτας τοῖς χοίροις. (Mat. vii. 6.)[2]

third male—an incorruptible light—called Christ. Under those come the elements, and eventually the Serpent, from which come directly the spirit, the soul, and all mundane things. Those "endless genealogies" (1 Tim. i. 4) and the angel-worship (Col. ii. 18) may show us what wild notions were afloat in Phrygia and Asia Minor in St Paul's day. Baur (Gnosis, pp. 118, 198) has drawn attention to the importance of the subdivisions of the Ophites,—all of them aiming at the development of the true principles which had been obscured or imprisoned in the Creation and Government of the world. Cain, the Sodomites, &c., were by most of them regarded as the overmatched upholders of the Truth. Christianity was the completion of those scattered and obscured lights. The 'Gospel of Judas' was current among some of them. Others looked back to Seth as the father of the spiritual species, and they maintained a more ordinary morality,—hence called Sethians. Some Gnostics kindred to the Ophites (Baur p. 193) had a "Gospel of Perfection"—τελείωσις—called also the Gospel of Eve, showing how the better state of things struggled for the mastery from the day of Eve till the Christian Era. Hippolytus, V. 6, quotes as the motto of the Naassenes, Ἀρχὴ τελειώσεως γνῶσις, γνῶσις ἀπηρτισμένη τελείωσις.

[2] See additional references. V. 8. p. 160 (*The Sower*), as in Luke viii. 5, Mat. xiii. 3, Mark iv. 3; V. 8. p. 166 (*The narrow way*), as in Mat. vii. 13; V. 9 (*The grain of mustard*), as in Mat. xiii. 31; V. 8. p. 152 (*The hidden treasure and the leaven*), as in Mat. xiii. 33, 44. And briefer, or more as echoes, Mat. v. 15 and x. 27 (p. 144); Mat. xiii. 13 (p. 150); Mat. ii. 18 (p. 162); Mat. vii. 13 (p. 164).

Ibid. c. 7. (p. 140.) *Ἥτις φησὶ τὴν ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπου βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ξητουμένην.* (Luke xvii. 21.)[3]

Ibid. (p. 148.) *Τουτέστι, φησί, τὸ γεγραμμένον· Τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, σάρξ ἐστι, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμα ἐστίν.* (John iii. 6.)[4]

Ibid. c. 8. (p. 150.) *Πάντα γὰρ, φησὶ, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν· Ὃ δὲ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστιν.* (John i. 3, 4.)

Ibid. (p. 152.) *Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ἐκείνοις γάμοις, ὃ στρέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐποίησεν οἶνον. Αὕτη, φησὶν, ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ ἀληθινὴ ἀρχὴ τῶν σημείων, ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.* (John ii. 1-11.)

Ibid. Τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος. Ἐὰν μὴ πίνητέ μου τὸ αἷμα καὶ φάγητέ μου τὴν σάρκα, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλὰ κἂν πίητε, φησὶ, τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ἐκεῖ ὑμεῖς εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύνασθε. (John vi. 53; viii. 21; xiii. 33; compare Mat. xx. 22 and Mark x. 38.)

Ibid. (p. 156.) *Διὰ τοῦτο, φησὶ, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη ἡ ἀληθινή.* (Compare John x. 9.)

Ibid. c. 9. (p. 166.) *Πνεῦμα γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός· διὸ, φησὶν, οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσκυνοῦσιν, οὔτε ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ, ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι. Πνευματικὴ γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τῶν τελείων ἡ προσκύνησις, οὐ σαρκική.* (John iv. 21, &c.)

Ibid. (p. 172.) *Εἰ δέ τις, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τυφλὸς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ μὴ τεθεαμένος φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα*

[3] For additional references to Luke see parallels to passages from Matthew. There is one passage, Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 7 (p. 142), which reminds us of Luke xvii. 4, but is not a quotation from Scripture: Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον, φησὶν, ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, ἑπτάκις πεσεῖται ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἀναστήσεται. There is also a passage quoted (which follows the quotation given in the text from Luke xvii. 21) as from "the Gospel inscribed According to Thomas" which is not in the otherwise extant fragments of that Gospel (Tisch., Proleg. Evv. Apocr. p XXXIX): Ἐμὲ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἑπτά· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανεροῦμαι. Hippolytus ascribes the passage "not to Christ, but to Hippocrates."

[4] The following are selected from the numerous references to John's Gospel; others may be added: Hippol. V. 8 (p. 158), (John vi. 44); V. 9 (p. 172), John iv. 10, v. 19-27, vii. 14; V. 8 (p. 154), John iii. 8, v. 37.

ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, δι' ἡμῶν ἀναβλεψάτω. (John ix. 1 and i. 9.)

Ibid. V. 7. (p. 138.) *Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως, κ.τ.λ. Ἐν γὰρ τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις, οἷς εἴρηκεν ὁ Παῦλος, κ.τ.λ.*[1] (Rom. i. 20.)

Peratae.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 12. (p. 178.) *Τοῦτό ἐστι, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀπολέσαι τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.* (John iii. 17; xii. 47.)

Ibid. V. 16. (p. 192.) *Τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον· Καὶ ὃν τρόπον ὕψωσε Μωϋσῆς τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.* (John iii. 14.)

Ibid. V. 17. (p. 196.) *Ὅταν οὖν, φησὶ, λέγῃ ὁσωτὴρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἐκεῖνον λέγει ἀφ' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς μεταλαβὼν τοὺς χαρακτῆρας μετενήνοχεν ἐνθάδε.* (Mat. vii. 11; v. 48, &c.)

Ibid. V. 17. (p. 198.) *Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον· Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα.* (John x. 7.)[2]

Ibid. V. 12. (p. 178.) *Ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ, φησὶν, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν ἢ γραφὴ . . .* (1 Cor. xi. 32.)

Ibid. (p. 178) (see also X. 10. p. 504.) *Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι φησὶ τὸ λεγόμενον· Πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα εὐδόκησε κατοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ σωματικῶς καὶ πᾶσά ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ θεότης τῆς οὕτω διηρημένης τριάδος.* (Col. ii. 9.)

Sethiani.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 21. (p. 212.) *Τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἶ-*

[1] Compare a probable echo, Hippol. V. 7 (p. 146), Rom. x. 18. See quotations: Hippol. V. 8 (p. 158), 2 Cor. xii. 2-4, 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; Hippol. V. 7 (p. 138), Gal. iii. 28, vi. 15; Hippol. V. 7 (p. 136), Eph. iii. 15; Ibid. (p. 146), Eph. v. 14; Hippol. V. 8 (p. 156), Eph. ii. 17.

[2] See also Hippol. V. 16 (p. 194) for quotation of John i. 1-4 (with γέγραπται), and Hippol. V. 17 (p. 196) for quotation of John viii. 44 with ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ.

[1] Other echoes may perhaps be found—Hippol. V. 19 (p. 206), compare John iv. 14; 2 Cor. v. 2; also same page, Acts ii. 24.

ρημένον οὐκ ἦλθον εἰρήνην βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν, τουτέστι τὸ διχάσαι καὶ χωρίσαι τὰ συγκεκραμένα. (Mat. x. 34.)

Ibid. X. 11. (p. 510) (see also V. 19.) *Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ εἰρημένον· Ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.* (Phil. ii. 6, 7.)

Justin.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 23. (p. 214.) *Ὡς ἐδίδασκεν ὁ λόγος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε.* (Mat. x. 5.)

Ibid. V. 26. (p. 228.) *Εἰπὼν δὲ τῇ Ἐδέμ· Γύναι, ἀπέχεις σου τὸν υἱόν, τουτέστι τὸν ψυχικὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸν χοϊκόν, αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς χεῖρας παραθέμενος τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀνῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν ἀγαθόν.* (Compare John xix. 26; Luke xxiii. 46.)

4. Basilides and Isidorus.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 20. (p. 356.) (*Basilides claimed to have received instruction from Matthias.*) *Βασιλείδης τοίνυν καὶ Ἰσίδωρος, ὁ Βασιλείδου παῖς γνήσιος καὶ μαθητὴς, φασὶν εἰρηκέναι Ματθίαν αὐτοῖς λόγους ἀποκρύφους, οὓς ἤκουσε παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος κατ' ἰδίαν διδαχθείς.*

Eus. H. E. IV. 7. (*He wrote twenty four books on the Gospel.*) *Ὧν εἰς ἡμᾶς κατῆλθεν ἐν τοῖς τότε γνωριμωτάτου συγγραφέως Ἀγρίππα Κάστορος ἱκανώτατος κατὰ Βασιλείδου ἔλεγχος, τὴν δεινότητα τῆς τἀνδρὸς ἀποκαλύπτων γοητείας. Ἐκφαίνων δ' οὖν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα, φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰς μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τέσσαρα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι συντάξαι βιβλία, προφήτας δὲ ἑαυτῷ ὀνομάσαι Βαρκαββᾶν καὶ Βαρκὼφ, κ.τ.λ.*

[1] Justin. Compare also Hippol. Ref. Haer. V. 27 (p. 230) with John iv. 14; v. 26 (p. 226) with Gal. v. 17.

[1] On Basilides see Introduction, where the quotations are discussed. Isidorus was his son. For Fragments of Isidorus's writings collected from Clem. Alex. see Stieren's Irenaeus, I. p. 907.

[2] This is the first notice of the Gospel of Basilides. It is possible (so Hilg. and Hort) that Origen was mistaken. But see Introduction.

Orig. Hom. in Luc. Tom. III. p. 933. (*Basilides 'dared to write a Gospel.'*[2]) See before, p. 82.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 27. (p. 376.) (*This Gospel was the Theology of the Supramundane.*) *Εὐαγγελίου ἐστὶ κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἡ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων γνῶσις, ὡς δεδήλωται, ἣν ὁ μέγας ἄρχων οὐκ ἠπίστατο.*

Jerome: Prooem. in Mat. Tom. IV. p. 2. (*Basilides's Gospel mentioned.*) See before, p. 99.

Archelai et Manetis Disputatio. Routh, Rel. Sac. V. p. 196. (*Basilides's Tractates extant in* A.D. 277.) Fuit predicator apud Persas etiam Basilides quidam antiquior, non longe post nostrorum Apostolorum tempora. . . . Extat etiam tertius decimus liber tractatuum ejus, cujus initium tale est, &c.[3]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 27. (p. 378.) (*The school of Basilides accepted the Gospel narratives.*) *Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γεγένηται κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς ὡς προειρήκαμεν. Γεγεννημένης δὲ τῆς γενέσεως τῆς προδεδηλωμένης, γέγονε πάντα ὁμοίως κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὡς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις γέγραπται.*

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 1. p. 508. *Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Οὐαλεντῖνον ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῶν θείων προβολῶν τὰς συζυγίας καταγαγόντες εὐαρεστοῦνται γάμῳ, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου πυθομένων φασὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων μή ποτε ἄμεινόν ἐστι τὸ μὴ γαμεῖν ἀποκρίνασθαι λέγουσι τὸν Κύριον· "Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι*[4] *τὸν λόγον τοῦτον· εἰσὶ γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι, οἱ μὲν ἐκ γενετῆς, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης·" ἐξηγοῦνται δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν ὧδέ πως· κ.τ.λ. Καὶ τὸ "ἄμεινον γαμῆσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι," μὴ εἰς πῦρ ἐμβάλῃς τὴν ψυχήν σου λέγειν τὸν ἀπόστολον, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἀντέχων καὶ φοβούμενος μὴ τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἀποπέσῃς· πρὸς γὰρ τὸ ἀντέχειν γενομένη ψυχὴ μερίζεται τῆς ἐλπίδος.* (Mat. xix. 11, 12; 1 Cor. vii. 9.)

[3] That this book of Tractates is the same as that which Eusebius mentions and Clem. Alex. quotes, there is no reason to doubt. Archelaus lived in the time of the Emperor Probus, A.D. 277. His Disputation is mentioned by Jerome and Epiphanius. The quotation refers to the dual origin of things. Basilides —an Alexandrian—is here said to have taught in Persia, but we know too little about the great heretic to regard this as impossible.

[4] The use of χωροῦσι is peculiar; and there is no good reason to doubt the quotation from Matthew when it is found. It has no parallel in the N. T., and but slight and few parallels in previous literature. (Sanday, Gospels in Second Century, p. 192.) See συγχωροῦσι used by Clement in the same chapter with the sense of "confirm" or "sanction." Clem. Strom. III. 1. p. 510.

Clem. Strom. IV. 12. p. 599. *Βασιλείδης δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ τρίτῳ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ μαρτύριον κολαζομένων αὐταῖς λέξεσι τάδε φησί· "φημὶ γὰρ τὸ ὁπόσοι ὑποπίπτουσι ταῖς λεγομέναις θλίψεσιν, ἤτοι ἡμαρτηκότες ἐν ἄλλοις λανθάνοντες πταίσμασιν εἰς τοῦτο ἄγονται τὸ ἀγαθὸν χρηστότητι τοῦ περιάγοντος, ἄλλα ἐξ ἄλλων ὄντως ἐγκαλούμενοι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατάδικοι ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι, μηδὲ λοιδορούμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχὸς ἢ ὁ φονεύς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Χριστιανοὶ πεφυκότες, ὅπερ αὐτοὺς παριγορήσει μηδὲ πάσχειν δοκεῖν . . ."* (1 Pet. iv. 14-16.)[5]

Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. Lib. V. p. 549. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 1015.) "Et ego," inquit (sc. apostolus), "mortuus sum," coepit enim jam mihi reputari peccatum. Sed haec Basilides non advertens de lege naturali debere intelligi, ad ineptias et impias fabulas sermonem apostolicum traxit, et in *μετενσωματώσεως* dogma, id est, quod animae in alia atque alia corpora transfundantur, ex hoc apostoli dicto conatur astruere. Dixit enim, inquit, Apostolus, quia, "Ego vivebam sine lege aliquando," hoc est, antequam in istud corpus venirem, in ea specie corporis vixi, quae sub lege non esset; pecudis scilicet vel avis. (Rom. vii. 9, 10.)

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 22. See before, p. 173. (John i. 9.)

Ibid. VII. 26. (p. 374.) *Κατῆλθεν [οὖν] ἀπὸ τῆς ἑβδομάδος τὸ φῶς, τὸ κατελθὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀγδοάδος ἄνωθεν τῷ υἱῷ τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ ἐφωτίσθη συνεξαφθεὶς τῷ φωτὶ τῷ λάμψαντι εἰς αὐτόν. Τοῦτο ἐστί, φησί, τὸ εἰρημένον· Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς υἱότητος διὰ τοῦ μεθορίου πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὴν ὀγδοάδα καὶ τὴν ἑβδομάδα διελθὸν μεχρὶ τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι, ἡ δύναμις τῆς κρίσεως ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκρωρείας ἄνωθεν [διὰ] τοῦ δημιουργοῦ μεχρὶ τῆς κτίσεως, ὅ ἐστι τοῦ υἱοῦ.* (Luke i. 35.)

Ibid. VII. 27. See before, p. 173. (John ii. 4; Mat. ii. 1, 2.)

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 24. p. 72. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 313.) *Φωραθήσεται δὲ οὗτος* (sc. *Βασιλείδης*) *διαβολικὴν δύναμιν εἰσηγούμενος κατὰ τῶν ψυχῶν, ἀπαρνησιθεΐαν αὐτὰς ἐκδιδάσκων,*

[5] Compare Eus. H. E. IV. 7, where Basilides's views of the smallness of the guilt of recantation are denounced.

ὁπότε αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος φησί· Τὸν ἀρνούμενόν με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ἀλλά φησιν ὁ ἀγύρτης· ἡμεῖς, φησὶν, ἐσμὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι πάντες ὗες καὶ κύνες. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἶπε· Μὴ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μηδὲ δότε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί. (Mat. x. 33; vii. 6.[6])

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 25. (p. 368.) *Ἔδει τὴν ὑπολελειμμένην υἱότητα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι καὶ ἀποκατασταθῆναι ἄνω ἐκεῖ ὑπὲρ τὸ μεθόριον πνεῦμα πρὸς τὴν υἱότητα τὴν λεπτομερῆ καὶ μιμητικὴν καὶ τὸν οὐκ ὄντα, ὡς γέγραπται, φησί· καὶ ἡ κτίσις αὐτὴ συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδεχομένη.* (Rom. viii. 19, 22.)

Ibid. Μέχρι μὲν οὖν Μωσέως ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἐβασίλευσε γὰρ ὁ μέγας ἄρχων ὁ ἔχων τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ μέχρι στερεώματος, νομίζων αὐτὸς εἶναι Θεὸς μόνος καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν εἶναι μηδὲν, πάντα γὰρ ἦν φυλασσόμενα ἀποκρύφῳ σιωπῇ. Τοῦτο, φησὶν, ἐστὶ τὸ μυστήριον, ὃ ταῖς προτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη, ἀλλὰ ἦν ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς χρόνοις βασιλεὺς καὶ Κύριος ὡς ἐδόκει τῶν ὅλων ὁ μέγας ἄρχων, ἡ ὀγδοάς. (Rom. v. 13, 14; Col. i. 26, 27.)

Ibid. (p. 370.) *Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔδει ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, φησὶν, ἡμᾶς τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, περὶ ὧν ἐστέναξε, φησὶν, ἡ κτίσις καὶ ὠδινεν, ἀπεκδεχομένη τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, ἦλθε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ διῆλθε διὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου.* (Rom. viii. 22; Eph. i. 21.)

Ibid. VII. 26. (p. 372.) *Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ σοφία ἐν μυστηρίῳ λεγομένη, περὶ ἧς, φησὶν, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει· οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος.* (1 Cor. ii. 7, 13.)

Ibid. Καθὼς γέγραπται, φησὶ· Κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καί· Ἤκουσα ἄῤῥητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ εἰπεῖν. (Eph. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 4.)

[6] It is not reasonable to say (Sup. Rel. II. 49) that "the variation in order is just what one might have expected from the use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or a similar work," but not if Basilides quoted St Matthew. For why? Do the Fathers quote so carefully? Do even MSS of the Gospels not alter the order of clauses?

Ibid. VII. 27. (p. 374.) Ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ, φησὶ, πᾶσα υἱότης καὶ ἔσται ὑπὲρ τὸ μεθόριον, τὸ πνεῦμα, τότε ἐλεηθήσεται ἡ κτίσις· στένει γὰρ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν καὶ βασανίζεται καὶ μένει τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Rom. viii. 19, 22.)

5. Marcion.[1]

1. date of marcion.

(*Contemporary of Justin Martyr.*) *Justin* Apol. I. c. 26. p. 70 A. Μαρκίωνα δέ τινα Ποντικὸν, ὃς καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστὶ

[1] Marcion. See before, Text, pp. 47, 50, 76-81 &c., and Notes on Marcion at pp. 75, 76, 77, 154, 162. Marcion's abrupt beginning (see below) gives ground for suspecting that there had been excision from an original, and further investigation proves the suspicion to be well founded. The fact that the omissions so often make the transition abrupt; the fact (so well brought out by Sanday) that in the omitted portions the "verified peculiarities of St Luke's style and diction are found in a proportion averaging considerably more than one to each verse," so that those 309 omitted verses are proved to be by the same writer as those which Marcion retained; and the consistent testimony of all the Fathers, give us as complete assurance as one can have on any such subject that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated Luke. He called it The Gospel—or The Gospel of Christ. He accompanied it with ten Pauline Epistles which he called τὸ Ἀποστολικόν. He made fewer changes on the Epistles than on the Gospel, and professed to find his theology in St Paul. His cardinal principle was that Christ came from the Good God to overturn the kingdom of the Jewish God; and his aim was to make a Gospel which established this principle. His doctrine of the evil of matter led him to teach that marriage is ruin. See Hippolyt. Ref. Haer. VIII. 16. The whole text of Marcion's Gospel, as constructed by Hahn from the numerous and systematic quotations of Tertullian and Epiphanius, and from the more incidental references of Irenaeus, Origen, the Pseudo-Origen (Dial. de Recta Fide), and others, is found in Thilo's Codex Apocryphus, 1832. Hahn's elaborate work has a permanent value, though some of his conclusions have been overthrown by more recent investigations. Hilgenfeld in his "Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's" (1850) has a list of the omissions in St Luke made by Marcion. Volkmar, in "Das Evangelium Marcion's" (1852), has given a full outline of the contents of the Gospel. In this work Volkmar expanded and defended his earlier articles (Tübing. Zeitsch. 1850). Anger's "Synopsis" contains almost full references to all the passages altered by Marcion. Roensch's "Das Neue Test. Tertullians" contains much interesting discussion. Reference is made below to "Supernatural Religion" and Dr Sanday's "Gospels &c." There is an excellent and suggestive statement in the Archbishop of York's (Thomson's) "Synoptic Gospels," republished from "The Speaker's Commentary" in his admirable volume "Word, Work and Will" (1879). These works and others have been used in compiling the following chapter, which, it is hoped, contains what the student seeks most to know regarding the great Gnostic critic. After some general quotations, with a rubric to each showing its bearing, a full list is given of Marcion's alterations of Luke's Gospel, with notes showing upon what principle the alterations were made in each case. This is a slight departure from the ordinary plan of this work, in which the original passages are all given. The extraordinary length of the quotations and remarks

διδάσκων τοὺς πειθομένους ἄλλον τινὰ νομίζειν μείζονα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ Θεόν· ὃς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων συλλήψεως πολλοὺς πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς Θεὸν, ἄλλον δέ τινα, ὡς ὄντα μείζονα, τὰ μείζονα παρὰ τοῦτον ὁμολογεῖν πεποιηκέναι. So also Ap. I. c. 58. p. 92 A.

2. TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS TO THE CHARACTER AND OBJECT OF MARCION'S WORK.

Justin, Apol. I. 26; I. 58 [as above under 1.]

Iren. B. I. 27. 2. [In Eus. H. E. IV. 11 are the first words *Διαδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν Μαρκίων ὁ Ποντικὸς, ἠύξησε τὸ διδασκαλεῖον, ἀπηρυθριασμένως βλασφημῶν.*] Succedens autem ei (sc. Cerdoni) Marcion Ponticus, adampliavit doctrinam, impudorate blasphemans eum, qui a lege et prophetis annuntiatus est Deus; malorum factorem et bellorum concupiscentem et inconstantem quoque sententia, et contrarium sibi ipsum dicens. Jesum autem ab eo Patre, qui est super mundi fabricatorem Deum, venientem in Judaeam temporibus Pontii Pilati praesidis, qui fuit procurator Tiberii Caesaris, in hominis forma manifestatum his qui in Judaea erant, dissolventem prophetas et legem et omnia opera ejus Dei, qui mundum fecit, quem et Cosmocratorem dicit. Et

of Tertullian and Epiphanius makes it impossible to reproduce them all here. And moreover, in this case the facts are not disputed. It is more important to collect them than to discuss them.

There are few more conclusive results attained in Biblical criticism than that which Volkmar achieved as against Ritschl, Baur, and Schwegler, who had argued for the priority of Marcion to the canonical Luke. Semler had conjectured that Marcion perhaps used a shorter Gospel, and Eichhorn had argued that the canonical Luke was a later edition of Marcion; but the Tübingen scholars made of it a great controversy. Volkmar had the satisfaction of finding his chief opponents publicly withdraw from their positions in consequence of his work. Hilgenfeld's independent investigations led him almost at the same time to the same conclusions as Volkmar; and he has stated them with characteristic force and brevity. The author of "Supernatural Religion," who in his earlier editions (as stated in our notes pp. 47 &c., which were printed off before the publication of his "Complete Edition" 1879) advocated the priority of Marcion to Luke, has (1879) modified his views, owing to the irresistible linguistic argument of Dr Sanday in his "Gospels in the Second Century," and has made frank admission of the change. His statement of the case on the other side remains, however—somewhat inconsistently—and may be consulted with advantage. Dr Sanday's is the last contribution of importance to the long controversy.

Some of Marcion's various readings—those in V. 14, 39; XII. 14, 38; XVII. 2; XXI. 27; XXIII. 2, have considerable support in Latin and Syriac versions and in D. See Tisch., Greek Test.; and compare Sanday, p. 231.

super haec, id quod est secundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens, et omnia quae sunt de generatione Domini conscripta auferens, et de doctrina sermonum Domini multa auferens, in quibus manifestissime conditorem hujus universitatis suum Patrem confitens Dominus conscriptus est; semetipsum esse veraciorem, quam sunt hi, qui evangelium tradiderunt, apostoli, suasit discipulis suis; non evangelium, sed particulam evangelii tradens eis. Similiter autem et apostoli Pauli epistolas abscidit, auferens quaecumque manifeste dicta sunt ab apostolo de eo Deo, qui mundum fecit, quoniam hic Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et quaecumque ex propheticis memorans apostolus docuit, praenuntiantibus adventum Domini. (See also B. III. 11, 7, 9; before, pp. 67, 69.)

(*Marcion corrupted the Gospels.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. I. 1. Quis tam comesor mus Ponticus quam qui evangelia corrosit?

(*Marcion mutilated Scripture: Valentinus explained it away.*) De Praescr. Haeret. cc. 32-38; see before, pp. 46-49.

(*Marcion in his Antitheses, quite distinct from his Gospel, expounded the New Testament as contradicting the Old.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. I. 19. Separatio legis et evangelii proprium et principale opus est Marcionis, nec poterunt negare discipuli ejus quod in summo instrumento habent, quo denique initiantur et indurantur in hanc haeresim. Nam hae sunt Antitheses Marcionis, id est contrariae oppositiones, quae conantur discordiam evangelii cum lege committere, ut ex diversitate sententiarum utriusque instrumenti diversitatem quoque argumententur deorum. (See also Adv. Marc. IV. 6; before, p. 81.)

(*Marcion contrasted Christ with the Creator.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. II. 29. Compendio interim possum Antitheses retudisse, gestientes ex qualitatibus ingeniorum sive legum sive virtutum discernere, atque ita alienare Christum a Creatore, ut optimum a judice, et mitem a fero, et salutarem ab exitioso.

(*Marcion's object was to remove all proof of the Incarnation.*) Tert. De Carne Christi, c. 1. Marcion ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem, aut ut nativitatem negaret, negavit et carnem, scilicet ne invicem sibi testimonium responderent nativitas et caro, quia nec nativitas sine carne, nec caro sine nativitate; quasi non eadem licentia haeretica et ipse potuisset aut

admissa carne nativitatem negare, ut Apelles discipulus et postea desertor ipsius, aut et carnem et nativitatem confessus aliter illas interpretari, ut condiscipulus et condesertor ejus Valentinus.

C. 2. *His opinor consiliis, tot originalia instrumenta Christi delere, Marcion, ausus es, ne caro ejus probaretur.* Ex quo, oro te? Exhibe auctoritatem. Si propheta es, praenuntia aliquid; si apostolus, praedica publice; si apostolicus, cum apostolis senti; si tantum Christianus es, crede quod traditum est. Si nihil istorum es, merito dixerim, morere! Nam et mortuus es, qui non es Christianus, non credendo quod creditum Christianos facit. Et eo magis mortuus es, quo magis non es Christianus; qui cum fuisses, excidisti, rescindendo quod retro credidisti, sicut et ipse confiteris in quadam epistola[1], et tui non negant et nostri probant. Igitur rescindens quod credidisti, jam non credens rescidisti; non tamen quia credere desiisti, recte rescidisti, atquin rescindendo quod credidisti, probas, antequam rescinderes, aliter fuisse. Quod credidisti aliter, illud ita erat traditum; porro quod traditum erat, id erat verum, ut ab eis traditum, quorum fuit tradere. Ergo quod erat traditum, rescindens, quod erat verum rescidisti.

(*Marcion prefixed no author's name to his Gospel.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 2. Marcion Evangelio, scilicet suo, nullum ascribet auctorem. See before, p. 76.—*Pseudo-Origen:* Dial. de recta in Deum fide, sect. I. (Origen, Migne, Vol. I. p. 1728.) Adamantius: *Τίς ἐστιν ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο, ὃ ἔφης εἶναι ἕν;* Megethius: *Ὁ Χριστός.* A. *Αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἔγραψεν· Ὅτι ἐσταυρώθην καὶ ἀνέστην τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; οὕτω γράφει;* M. *Ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος προσέθηκεν.* A. *Παρῆν γὰρ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστόν;* M. *Αὐτὸς ἔγραψεν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἁπλῶς.*[2]

Ibid. (p. 1781.) Marcus: *Οὐ Πέτρος ἔγραψεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς, τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.*

(*Marcion mutilated Luke's Gospel.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 2. Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse quem caederet. (See before, for

[1] See allusions to (apparently the same) epistle of Marcion's: Adv. Marc. IV. 4 (see before, p. 79); and to Marcion's original beliefs: De Praesc. Haer. c. 3; Adv. Marc. I. 1.

[2] Megethius and Marcus are Marcionites; Adamantius is orthodox. This treatise is ascribed to the fourth century.

context p. 76.) Compare Irenaeus, B. III. 12. 12; III. 14. 1. (See before, p. 161.)

(*Marcion and his disciples claimed for this Gospel priority to Luke's.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 4. (See before, p. 78.)

(*Marcion's disciples altered their Gospel to obviate objections.*) Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 5. See before, p. 81. (On the divisions of the Marcionites comp. Eus. H. E. V. 13.)

(*Where Marcion's Gospel began.*) Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 31. (p. 396.) *Μαρκίων τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν παντάπασι παρητήσατο, ἄτοπον εἶναι νομίζων ὑπὸ τὸ πλάσμα τοῦ ὀλεθρίου τούτου νείκους γεγονέναι τὸν λόγον τὸν τῇ φιλίᾳ συναγωνιζόμενον, τουτέστι τῷ ἀγαθῷ, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς γενέσεως ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος κατεληλυθότα αὐτὸν ἄνωθεν, μέσον ὄντα κακοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ, διδάσκειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς.* (Luke iii. 1; iv. 31.)

(*The Marcionite dogmas regarding human nature.*) Ibid. X. 19. (p. 524.) *Μαρκίων δὲ ὁ Ποντικὸς καὶ Κέρδων ὁ τούτου διδάσκαλος καὶ αὐτοὶ ὁρίζουσιν εἶναι τρεῖς τὰς τοῦ παντὸς ἀρχάς, ἀγαθὸν, δίκαιον, ὕλην. . . . Τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πεπέμφθαι ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ψυχῶν, ὃν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον καλεῖ, ὡς ἄνθρωπον φανέντα λέγων οὐκ ὄντα ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὡς ἔνσαρκον οὐκ ἔνσαρκον, δοκήσει πεφηνότα, οὔτε γένεσιν ὑπομείναντα οὔτε πάθος ἀλλὰ τῷ δοκεῖν. Σάρκα δὲ οὐ θέλει ἀνίστασθαι, γάμον δὲ φθορὰν εἶναι λέγων κυνικωτέρῳ βίῳ προσάγει τοὺς μαθητὰς, ἐν τούτοις νομίζων λυπεῖν τὸν δημιουργὸν, εἰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότων ἢ ὡρισμένων ἀπέχοιτο.*

(*Marcionites denied the unity of the Four Gospels.*) Origen, Comment. in Joann. Tom. V. p. 98. (See before, p. 85.)

Ibid. Tom. X. 4. p. 165. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 316.) *Ἐγὼ δ' οἶμαι καὶ τὸν Μαρκίωνα παρεκδεξάμενον ὑγιεῖς λόγους, ἀθετοῦντα αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκ Μαρίας γένεσιν, κατὰ τὴν θείαν αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἀποφήνασθαι, ὡς ἄρα οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ἐκ Μαρίας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τετολμηκέναι περιγράψαι τούτους τοὺς τόπους ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου.*

(*The Marcionite Canon.*) Epiph. Haer. I. t. 3. h. 42. p. 309. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 708.)[3] *Ἐλεύσομαι δὲ εἰς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγραμ-*

[3] Epiphanius here shows what the Marcionite Canon was composed of; and intimates that he, like Tertullian, can prove the main Christian verities against Marcion, even from what Marcion allowed to remain in his "Gospel."

μένα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐῤῥαδιουργημένα. Οὗτος γὰρ ἔχει Εὐαγγέλιον μόνον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, περικεκομμένον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, διὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος σύλληψιν, καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν. Οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπέτεμεν ὁ λυμηνάμενος ἑαυτὸν ἥπερ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ τέλους καὶ τῶν μέσων πολλὰ περιέκοψε τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγων· ἄλλα δὲ παρὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα προστέθεικε. Μόνῳ δὲ κέχρηται τούτῳ τῷ χαρακτῆρι τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἔχει δὲ καὶ Ἐπιστολὰς παρ' αὐτῷ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου δέκα, αἷς μόναις κέχρηται, οὐ πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐν αὐταῖς γεγραμμένοις, ἀλλά τινα αὐτῶν περιτέμνων, τινὰ δὲ ἀλλοιώσας κεφάλαια. Ταύταις δὲ ταῖς δυσὶ βίβλοις κέχρηται. Ἄλλα δὲ συντάγματα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ συνέταξε τοῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πλανωμένοις. Αἱ δὲ Ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ παρ' αὐτῷ λεγόμεναί εἰσι· πρώτη μὲν πρὸς Γαλάτας, δευτέρα δὲ πρὸς Κορινθίους, τρίτη πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα, τετάρτη πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πέμπτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, ἕκτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δευτέρα, ἑβδόμη πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ὀγδόη πρὸς Κολωσσεῖς, ἐννάτη πρὸς Φιλήμονα, δεκάτη πρὸς Φιλιππησίους. Ἔχει δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικείας λεγομένης μέρη. Ἐξ οὗπερ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ σωζομένου, τοῦ τε Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, δεῖξαι αὐτὸν ἐν Θεῷ ἔχομεν ἀπατεῶνα καὶ πεπλανημένον, καὶ ἀκρότατα διελέγξαι. Ἐξ αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀναμφιβόλως τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁμολογουμένων ἀνατραπήσεται. Ἐκ γὰρ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔτι παρ' αὐτοῦ λειψάνων, τοῦ τε Εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν εὑρισκομένων, δειχθήσεται ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς συνετοῖς μὴ ἀλλότριος εἶναι διαθήκης, καὶ οἱ προφῆται οὖν οὐκ ἀλλότριοι ὄντες τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνδημίας, κ.τ.λ.

(*How Epiphanius set to work.*) *Ibid.* p. 310. Παραθήσομαι δὲ καὶ ἣν ἐποιησάμην κατ' αὐτοῦ πραγματείαν, πρὶν τοῦ ταύτην μου τὴν σύνταξιν ἐσπουδακέναι διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν τῶν ἀδελφῶν προτροπῆς ποιήσασθαι. Ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἱκανῶν ἀνερευνῶν τὴν τούτου τοῦ Μαρκίωνος ἐπινενοημένην ψευδηγορίαν, καὶ ληρώδη διδασκαλίαν, αὐτὰς δὴ τὰς τοῦ προειρημένου βίβλους, ἃς κέκτηται μετὰ χεῖρας λαβών, τό τε παρ' αὐτῶν λεγόμενον Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ἀποστολικὸν καλούμενον παρ' αὐτῷ ἐξανθισάμενος, καὶ ἀναλεξάμενος καθ' εἱρμὸν ἀπὸ τῶν προειρημένων δύο βιβλίων τὰ ἐλέγξαι αὐτὸν δυνάμενα, ἐδάφιόν τι συντάξεως ἐποιησάμην, ἀκολούθως τάξας κεφάλαια, καὶ ἐπιγράψας ἑκάστῃ ῥήσει, πρώτην, δευτέραν, τρίτην. Καὶ οὕτως ἕως τέλους διεξῆλθον, ἐν οἷς φαί-

νεται ἰλιθίως καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐπὶ ταύτας τὰς παραμεινάσας τοῦ τε Σωτῆρος καὶ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέξεις φυλάττων. Αἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν παρηλλαγμένως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐῤῥαδιουργήθησαν, καὶ ὡς οὐκ εἶχε τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγελίῳ τὸ ἀντίγραφον, οὔτε ἡ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἔμφασις· ἄλλα δὲ φύσει ὡς ἔχει καὶ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, μὴ ἀλλαγέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, δυνάμενα δὲ αὐτὸν διελέγχειν, δι' ὧν δείκνυται Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη συμφωνοῦσα πρὸς τὴν Νέαν, καὶ ἡ Καινὴ πρὸς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην. Ἄλλαι δὲ πάλιν λέξεις τῶν αὐτῶν βιβλίων ὑποφαίνουσι Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν τελείως ἐνηνθρωπηκέναι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλαι πάλιν ὁμολογοῦσαι τὴν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἕνα ὄντα Κύριον πάντων παντοκράτορα, αὐτὸν ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γενομένων, καὶ οὔτε παραχαράσσουσαι τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου τὴν κλῆσιν, οὔτε μὴν ἀρνούμεναι τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν πάντων, ἀλλὰ δηλοῦσαι τὸν σαφῶς ὡμολογημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ κηρύγματος. Καὶ ἔστι τὰ ἡμῖν πεπραγματευμένα ἐν ὑποκειμένοις παρατιθέμενα, ἅτινά ἐστι τάδε.

Ibid. p. 311. Ὅτῳ φίλον ἐστὶ τὰς τοῦ ἀπατηλοῦ Μαρκίωνος νόθους ἐπινοίας ἀκριβοῦν, καὶ τὰς ἐπιπλάστους τοῦ αὐτοῦ βοσκήματος μηχανὰς διαγινώσκειν, τουτωῖ τῷ συλλελεγμένῳ πονήματι ἐντυχεῖν μὴ κατοκνείτω. Ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ Εὐαγγελίου τὰ πρὸς ἀντίῤῥησιν τῆς πανούργου αὐτοῦ ῥᾳδιουργίας σπουδάσαντες παρεθέμεθα· ἵν' οἱ τῷ πονήματι ἐντυχεῖν ἐθέλοντες, ἔχωσι τοῦτο γυμνάσιον ὀξύτητος πρὸς ἔλεγχον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπινενοημένων ξενολεξιῶν.

Philastrius de haeres. Marcion secundum Lucam Evangelium solum accipit . . . quae enim de Christo dicunt Scripturae, ut de Deo vero, praeterit, quae autem quasi de homine dicunt, accipit capitula.

Theodoreti haeret. fabul. I. 24. Αὐτὸς δὲ Μαρκίων ἐκ μὲν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἐδέξατο μόνον, τὴν γενεαλογίαν περικόψας τὰ πλεῖστα.

3. CONTENTS OF MARCION'S GOSPEL. (See note on p. 390.)

Luke I. II. omitted entirely.

[Marcion did not find that the Preface suited his purpose. He did not admit that John was the forerunner of the true Christ, but regarded him as representing the God of the Old Testament. All reference to his miraculous birth was therefore expunged. He retained v. 33; vii. 18, &c.; ix. 7, 19; xi. 1; xx. 4-6. But all these can be explained in conformity with his principles. The Birth and Nativity of our Lord were not allowed to remain on the record, because Marcion could not admit that Christ came in the flesh.]

III. 1, combined with IV. 31, made the opening words of Marcion's Gospel:

Ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος [ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας] ὁ Θεὸς κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ, πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν διδάσκων ἐν τοῖς σάββασι.

[The words in brackets are added on the testimony of the Pseudo-Origen, Dial. de recta fide, Sect. II. 823 B. Migne, p. 1765 (ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Πιλάτου). All the authorities agree that Marcion's Gospel began with Luke iii. 1, and it appears that he added the words of iv. 31 so as to make it appear that Christ descended from heaven to the synagogue of Capernaum. Κατῆλθεν has therefore a very different meaning from that which Luke gives it. There is doubt as to the nominative to κατῆλθεν. Tertullian says *proponit Deum descendisse.* Epiphanius has his usual καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς without being definite. Hahn has ὁ Θεός, Volkmar ὁ Ἰησοῦς.]

III. 1-38 omitted. (See Epiph. Haer. 42. § 11. p. 312. Migne, p. 711.)

[Marcion could take no cognisance of the Baptist's preaching, nor could he admit that Christ was baptized by an O. T. prophet: vv. 20-22 had no meaning for Marcion.]

IV. 1-13 omitted. (See Epiph. Haer. 42. Ref. 60. p. 343. Migne, p. 760.)

[The Temptation would have been an empty formality in Marcion's view (Hilg.), also too like Israel in the wilderness (Baur), and Christ did not come to fulfil the Old Testament.]

IV. 14. 15 omitted.

16. *οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος* omitted.

17-19 omitted. vv. 20, 21, may have been retained.

[These verses omitted because fulfilling Isaiah lxi. 1. 2.]

22. *καὶ ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ* omitted.

23. *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου* omitted.

Luke IV. 24. omitted.

27. probably omitted.

34. *Ναζαρηνέ* omitted.

[Christ would be of the earth if "Nazarene" were retained. Marcion omitted all mention of N. as Christ's birthplace. Compare Luke xviii. 37, xxiv. 19. Epiphanius does not say that the word was omitted in those cases, but Tert. Adv. Marcion (IV. 8) seems to say so. The Pseudo-Origen (Dial. de recta fide, p. 858 C; Migne, p. 1852) distinctly says so. Ναζωραῖος might not be in Marcion's opinion the same as Ναζαρηνός, but he seems to have expunged both, and Tert. (IV. 8) regards them as the same—a native of Nazareth.]

Marcion opened his narrative in the following order: III. 1 combined with IV. 31. Then came IV. 32-39. 16 (curtailed) [20, 21] (?) 22 (curtailed). 23, [27] (??) 28, 29, 30, 40-44.

[There is not absolute agreement as to the exact words with which Marcion's excisions in this chapter began and ended.]

V. 14. *ὑμῖν* for *αὐτοῖς*.

[Not a mere variation (Hilg.), but to draw more emphatically the line between Christ and the servants of the Demiurge to whom the healed person belonged (Volkmar). Tert. IV. 9 says, *Ut sit vobis in testimonium.* So Epiph. Haer. 42. § 11. p. 312, Ἵνα ᾖ μαρτύριον τοῦτο ὑμῖν. In Cod. D the reading is Ἵνα εἰς μαρτύριον ᾖ ὑμῖν τοῦτο: *Ut sit in testimonium vobis hoc.* See Sanday, Gospels in Second Century, p. 231, for other codd. Some of the pernicious readings with which Epiph. p. 312 charges Marcion are merely variations in the order of words, as in V. 28, &c.]

V. 39. omitted (probably).

[The omission of the early chapters makes the introduction of John in V. 33 abrupt, and Tert. (IV. 11) does not fail to say that Marcion makes John appear as suddenly as Christ.]

VI. 17. *ἐν αὐτοῖς* for *μετ' αὐτῶν*. See Epiph. p. 312. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 712.)

23. *ὑμῶν* for *αὐτῶν* (Epiph.), but Tert. reads *eorum* (*αὐτῶν*).

VII. 31-35.

[The author of Supernatural Religion had a discussion of this passage beginning, "It is generally agreed that the verses Luke vii. 29-35 were wanting in Marcion's Gospel." In his "Complete Edition" he has altered this into, "Some critics believe that the verses Luke vii. 29-35 were wanting in Marcion's Gospel." But his note is not clear, and the discussion in his text remains. It may therefore be well to say that Tertullian found nothing to remark upon in the verses, and therefore passed them by. Epiphanius is silent because Marcion's Gospel *did not* omit them. Volkmar and

Hilgenfeld believe that Marcion's Gospel contained them. The critics who omit the verses are therefore Hahn, who founds on the silence of Tertullian, and (a mistake as to) the bearing of Marcion's system; and Ritschl, *who would omit* 29, 30 *as well as* 31-35, because he does not think them properly connected with the context.]

Luke VIII. 19. omitted.

21. Inserted: *τίς μου ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί;*

[By leaving out verse 19 Marcion got rid of the *Evangelist's* statement: "There came to Him His mother and His brethren;" and the other verses thereafter witness in favour of Marcion's system. To make this witness more clear, he inserted from Matthew or Mark: "Who are my mother and my brethren?" This is an illustration of what Marcion did when alteration served his purpose better than simple omission. (See Hilg. p. 451.) It appears that the allegation of the Heretics was that *Temptandi gratia nuntiaverant ei matrem et fratres, quos non habebat.* (Tert. De Carne Christi, c. 7.) Tertullian in that passage and in Adv. Marc. IV. 19 says that this question, "Who are my mother,?" &c. was the most constant argument of Marcion, and of "all" who denied the Incarnation.]

IX. 40. Epiphanius (Sch. 19) notes some change obscurely.

X. 4. Marcion perhaps read *ῥάβδον*. (Hilg.)

21. Marcion omitted *καὶ τῆς γῆς*.

[He could not retain an expression which called the Father of Christ "*Lord of earth.*" In XII. 22-31 he retains the care of this world under the Creator; but in the present passage Christ was addressing *His God*, and Marcion omitted the phrase connecting that God with the earth.]

22. Marcion changed the order and had the Aorist, his text being apparently: *Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν, κ.τ.λ.*

[This reading depends mainly on Irenaeus, B. IV. 6. 1. *Nemo cognovit Patrem, nisi Filius, nec Filium, nisi Pater et cui voluerit Filius revelare.* Irenaeus shows that it was not only the Marcionite, but a common Gnostic, reading; obviously because the Aorist permitted (if it did not suggest) an Anti-Old-Testament meaning, as though the True God had not been known before the coming of Christ. The Aorist however was common enough among orthodox Fathers. See before, notes on Justin, pp. 60, 118. See full list in Anger's Synopsis in loc. Pseudo-Origen, Dial. de recta fide, p. 817, has οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν π. . . . οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν τις γινώσκει . . . which is the most consistent reading from Marcion's point of view.]

25. omitted *αἰώνιον*.

[Marcion could not admit any connection between the Law of the O. T. and Eternal Life. In c. XVIII. 18 the word αἰώνιον is retained, but in that case the insufficiency of the commandments is shown.]

XI. 2. Instead of *Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου*, Marcion read *Ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*.

[This rests on Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 26, and is not quite clear. Tisch. argues (see Gr. Test. in loc.) that Marcion really read ἁγιασθήτω, κ.τ.λ. Greg. Nyss. has ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγ. πν.—The author of Sup. Rel. II. 126 says that this "is recognized to be the true original reading"!]

29-32. Omitted *εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ*—to *πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε*, vv. 29-32.

[Marcion did not admit of any comparison between Christ and men of the other and inferior religion. See below, note on XI. 49-51.]

42. Marcion read *κλῆσιν* for *κρίσιν*.

[It appears that Marcion did not wish to connect Judgment with the Good God. Tertullian's argument on the passage does not seem to make κλῆσιν = hospitality (as it is sometimes translated in this case), but connects *vocationem* with *dilectionem Dei* (IV. 27), so as to make it appear that it means *calling*, calling by God. His argument is that Christ says nothing against the Law, but denounces those who misunderstood it: further, that what Marcion retains regarding Christ is the same as the O. T. revelation of God; ascribing to him the function of judging (condemning), and caring for both external and internal conduct. See XVI. 19-31. Marcion interpreted the passage as referring to the Creator's Hell, and supposed v. 29 to be spoken of the Jews only. See Epiph. Sch. et Ref. 44-46.]

49-51. omitted.

[Marcion could not put the prophets of the O. T. and the apostles of the N. T. on the same footing, as in this passage. Σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ was ascribed to the O. T. The wonder is that he retained so much of this section of S. Luke. He has elsewhere retained quotations from the O. T. like VI. 3 (mere dialectic in his opinion); VII. 27 (merely the Baptist as forerunner of Christ whom the Demiurge would send); XX. 41-44—like XX. 4—(merely an appeal to embarrass the Jews). (See Hilg. p. 452.)]

XII. 6 (7?). omitted.

[Tertullian passes by those words (IV. 28). Epiphanius, Sch. 29, says that Marcion omitted v. 6; but he makes no mention of v. 7. The verses seem to stand or fall together. Marcion would ascribe v. 5 to the Demiurge into whose hands would fall all unbelievers in Christ. V. 6 (and in some measure v. 7) must have seemed to him to confuse the spheres of Christ and the Creator.]

8. 9. *ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ* instead of *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

[See below, on XV. 10.]

10. omitted *ἢ μεριστήν*. (Tert. IV. 28.)

28. omitted (Epiph.), not omitted (Tertullian).

[It is possible that the Marcionites had omitted those words before Epiphanius wrote, though Marcion himself had not.]

Luke XII. 32. *ὑμῶν* omitted. See Epiph. Sch. 34.

38. *τῇ ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ* instead of *ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ*. See Epiph. Sch. 35.

[Epiphanius says ὁ κτηνώδης forgets that watches are all during the night, and that there is no evening one. But the first of the night watches might be called the evening watch.]

XIII. 1-5; 6-9 omitted.

[Epiphanius is somewhat ambiguous, as it is uncertain whether the parable of the fig-tree is included in the omission. Tertullian (c. 30) passes direct from XII. 59 to XIII. 10. Hilgenfeld only omits vv. 1-5; but Hahn, Volkmar and Anger omit also 6-9.]

28. Marcion read: *Ὅτε πάντας τοὺς δικαίους ἴδητε ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους καὶ κρατουμένους ἔξω· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς, καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.* Epiph. Sch. 40.

29-35. omitted.

[Verses 29, 30 show that it is the same God as in the O. T. who now puts the heathen in the place of the Jews. Verses 31-35 represent Christ as the God and the Messiah of the Jews. Ritschl and Baur regarded the omission of the whole as a proof of the originality of Marcion's Gospel.]

XIV. 26. *καταλείπει* instead of *μισεῖ*.

XV. 10. *ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ* instead of *ἐν. τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

[Marcion understood this of the Lord God. Tertullian (c. 32) teaches that it must refer to the Creator, the Same who long ago proclaimed His longing that the sinner should not die but repent.]

11-32. The Prodigal Son. Omitted.

[This was omitted because of representing the Supreme God as in the same relation of Father to both Jews and heathen. It was not because of his repugnance to feasting that Marcion omitted the parable. He retains some non-ascetic passages, as the Bridegroom, V. 34; the wedding, XII. 36; XIV. 8; the heavenly feast, XIV. 15-24. See Hilg. p. 454; Volkmar p. 66.]

XVI. 12. Marcion read *ἐμόν* for *ὑμέτερον*. (Tert. c. 33.)

[Ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ referred to the Demiurge's goods: τὸ ἐμόν brought in the contrast of Christ's.]

17. Marcion altered *ἢ τοῦ νόμου*.

[Ἡ τῶν λόγων μου instead of ἢ τοῦ νόμου (so Ritschl, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld). They rest on Tertullian. But Tertullian is uncertain. He says (c. 33) in one place: *Transeat igitur coelum et terra citius, sicut et lex et prophetae, quam unus apex verborum Domini.* But again he says: *Ideo subtexuit facilius elementa transitura quam verba sua.* Epiphanius passes it by

and comments on V. 16. Hahn renders Tertullian into Greek, . . . παρελθεῖν, ὡς καὶ ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, ἢ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν. So also Anger.]

XVII. 2. *εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη* added. Tert. IV. 35.

10. omitted. Epiph. Sch. 47.

[Hahn omits 7-10 mainly on the ground of the silence of Tertullian, but partly also because of Marcion's asceticism, to which feasting was repugnant. As regards the latter ground see before, note on XV. 11-32; and Tertullian's silence is not enough to cause the omission.]

14. Epiphanius says, Sch. 48: *Ὅτε συνήντησαν οἱ δέκα λεπροί. Ἀπέκοψε δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἐποίησεν· Ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς, λέγων· Δείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι· καὶ ἄλλα ἀντ' ἄλλων ἐποίησε, λέγων, ὅτι Πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν ἡμέραις Ἐλισσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐκ ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Νεεμᾶν ὁ Σύρος.*

[That is to say, Marcion introduced here Luke iv. 27. Epiphanius twits Marcion with making a quotation in which the Lord calls Elisha a prophet. Hilgenfeld reads the passage thus: Καὶ ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν ἡμέραις . . . ὁ Σύρος (iv. 27.) πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι. This is better than Hahn's which is v. 14; iv. 27; vv. 15, 16, 17, &c. Tertullian (c. 35) seems to say that nothing essential was wanting in Marcion's text.]

XVIII. 19. *Μή με λέγε ἀγαθόν· Εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ.*

[Marcion added ὁ πατήρ to distinguish the Supreme God from the Demiurge, who, though God, was not Father. See on the reading Μή με λέγε, κ.τ.λ. before, p. 116, Notes 6, 7.]

31-34. omitted. Epiph. Sch. 52.

[Omitted, as Marcion could not admit that Christ's death fulfilled O. T. prophecy. In the same way xxii. 35-38, and xxiv. 25, 27, 32, 44, 45 were omitted. On the other hand Marcion retained, vii. 27, &c., because he identified John the Baptist with the rule of the Demiurge, and could therefore admit that Malachi, an O. T. prophet, predicted his coming. Marcion also retained x. 25; xi. 42; v. 34, there being in each case no identification of Christ with the Law.]

37. Marcion omitted *Ναζωραῖος*. See before, on IV. 34.

XIX. 9. Marcion omitted (apparently) *καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν*. So Tert. c. 37. Epiph. is silent.

29-46. Epiph. Sch. 53.

[Epiphanius says that the omission was to σπήλαιον ληστῶν. Tert. (c. 37) is silent as to the whole of the chapter after v. 27. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar omit also vv. 47. 48.]

Luke XX. 1(β)-18. omitted.

[Epiphanius is obscure, but it appears as though Marcion read v. 1: Ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐζήτησαν ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν; thus connecting v. 1(α) with v. 19(α). He must have omitted also v. 19(β), ἔγνωσαν γὰρ . . . εἶπεν, as depending on what went before.

19(β). omitted. See last note.

35. Reference to Resurrection omitted.

[Hilgenfeld (so also Ritschl) reads as Marcion's text: οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν. Volkmar agrees with this. Tert. c. 38 reads: *Quos autem dignatus est Deus illius aevi.* Hahn renders this more literally, Οὓς δὲ κατηξίωσεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου, κ.τ.λ.]

37. 38. omitted.

[The doctrine bearing on the O. T. was displeasing to Marcion. Epiphanius (Ref. 56, 57) puts this parable beside that of Lazarus (Ref. 52), and speaks of it as "a repetition" of the same doctrine]

XXI. (18.) 21. 22. omitted. See Epiph. Sch. 58. 59.

[These verses show an interest in Jerusalem and the Jews, which Marcion could not endure.]

27. *μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως* [*καὶ δόξης*]. (Tert. IV. 39.)

36. omitted *Καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.*

[Tert. (c. 39) quotes other verses but omits this, resuming at v. 37.]

XXII. 3. omitted.

[Tert. V. 6 says: *Scriptum est enim apud me Satanam in Judam introisse*, which can only mean that in Marcion's Gospel this incident was omitted. See also Epiph. Sch. 60, with which this conclusion is at least not inconsistent. Marcion's theory that Christ was opposed to the Creator made it difficult for him to find a place for Satan as the Tempter.]

16. 17. 18. 30 (?). omitted.

[There is much difficulty in accounting for, or even enumerating, Marcion's omissions. He certainly retained the direction to Peter to prepare the Passover,—Epiph. Sch. 61. He also retained v. 15, Epiph. Sch. and Ref. 62. And the mere fact of his leaving that verse in such a position shows that Luke's was the original text which he mutilated. (Hilg. p. 472.) But it is not certain whether he omitted vv. 17. 18. It seems most likely that he omitted the whole 16-18, in order to leave no trace of the connection between the O. T. feast and the Institution of the Lord's Supper. What was left therefore pointed to an act of remembrance (v. 19) in which was no trace of bodily communion. Jesus took the Bread—a mere symbol of the Body which was itself a semblance—and said, "Do this in remembrance of me." He probably omitted v. 30 also, lest it should point to carnal views of His Kingdom. (See however Hilgenf. p. 433.) All this

seems the most probable account of Marcion's proceedings. But it leaves the reference to "this Passover" in v. 15 as unaccountable as Epiphanius (Ref. 62) says it is. By leaving it, Marcion really undid all his undoing; and the Christian Sacrament remains connected with the Jewish Passover. Epiphanius does not say (Sch. 63) that Marcion omitted more than v. 16, but his reasoning (Ref. 63) shows that the omission went on to the end of v. 18, ἵνα δῆθεν μὴ ποιήσῃ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ βρωτὰ ἢ ποτά.]

35-38. omitted.

[The reference to O. T. prophecy caused the omission. Epiph. Sch. 64 does not define the close of the omission, saying merely καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. But v. 38 was too like the Jewish Messiah to be admitted. See Volkmar, p. 69.]

49-51. omitted.

[Epiphanius argues that Marcion was anxious for Peter's honour, and obscured the Saviour's. Epiphanius seems to forget that the Synoptists do not say Peter was the disciple. The motive of the omission is not clear. See Volkmar, p. 70, Hilg. p. 457.]

XXIII. 2. Marcion read: *Τοῦτον εὕρομεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος, [καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας] καὶ κελεύοντα φόρους μὴ δοῦναι [καὶ ἀναστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα]*, where the passages in brackets are additions to the text. They are found in some Latin MSS. (See Sanday, 'Gospels in Second Century,' p. 232.)

34. The conclusion of the verse from *διαμεριζόμενοι* was wanting in Tertullian's copy of the Marcionite Gospel, but remained in Epiphanius's copy.

43. omitted. (Epiph. Sch. 72.)

[Marcion's reason for omitting it is uncertain. Marcion retained the parable XVI. 19-31 as referring to the Creator's Hades, in which there were different grades of suffering; but he did not allow that Christ went there. The Marcionite in Dial. de recta fide p. 827 C. says that Abraham was in Hades but not in the Kingdom of Heaven. See Hilg. p. 469, Volkmar p. 100, for notes showing utter perplexity. But Marcion probably did not wish to identify the future of the Divine Christ with that of this human believer.]

XXIV. 25. Marcion read *ἐφ' οἷς ἐλάλησεν* [*ἐλάλησα* (by mistake in Epiph.)] *ὑμῖν* instead of *ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται*. See Tert. IV. 43.

25 to 49. Shortened and changed.

[Probably 27, 32, 44(β)-46(α) were omitted; v. 47 was retained to ἔθνη; 47(β to 53) omitted. It appears as though both Tertullian and Epiphanius were tired noting the many variations, and became remiss at the end of

their work on Marcion's Gospel. It appears certain that he retained vv. 37 to 39. Both Tertullian and Epiphanius show how inconsistent with Marcion's central position of the unreality of Christ's body this passage is; unless indeed (as Tertullian suggests) he interpreted v. 39 to mean that if they looked at Christ (it seems that Marcion omitted ψηλαφήσατε) they would see that He was a spirit without flesh and bones. But what of v. 41, which seems to have been retained? Irenaeus (B. III. 14. 3, 4) distinctly says that both Marcion and Valentinus retain "all the things which He said after the resurrection to His disciples on the way, and how they knew Him in the breaking of bread." He adds, naturally enough, that they must either accept more of the Gospel when they retain so much, or give up even what they have. Hilgenfeld says, Marcion omitted v. 27 wholly, the close of v. 32, and omitted, or at least much shortened, vv. 44, 45. Volkmar's list is 27, 32 (close), 44 (partly), 45, 46 (partly). It appears from Tertullian's closing words that, according to Marcion, Christ commanded the disciples to preach to all nations; and Epiphanius (Haer. 42 C. 9. p. 305, Migne, Vol. I. p. 708) says that Marcion cut off the close of the Gospel as well as its beginning. We conclude therefore that his Gospel ended with a paragraph made up, as above, from 44(β)-47(α) and that its last word was ἔθνη. Tertullian's characteristic conclusion is: *Misereor tui, Marcion: frustra laborasti. Christus enim Jesus in Evangelio tuo meus est.* Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 43.]

Marcion and The Epistles.

Irenaeus, Haer. B. I. 27. 2. (See before, p. 391, and compare Iren. Haer. III. 12. 12.)

Tert. Adv. Marc. IV. 3. (See before, p. 78.)

Epiph. Haer. 42. (See before, p. 394.)

Tert. Adv. Marc. V. 1. Quod idcirco praestruximus, ut jam hinc profiteamur nos proinde probaturos nullum alium Deum ab Apostolo circulatum, sicut probavimus nec a Christo, ex ipsius utique Epistolis Pauli, quas proinde mutilatas etiam de numero forma jam haeretici evangelii praejudicasse debebit.

Epiph. Haeres. I. t. 3. h. 42. p. 317. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 720.) *Ἔτι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα συνάπτομεν. Κατὰ τοῦ προειρημένου αἱρεσιάρχου ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμῶν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ πεπραγματευμένῃ σχέσει· ἅτινα παρ᾽ αὐτῷ πάλιν ἐφεύρομεν, ὡς ἐν ἐθελοδοκήσει τῶν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου Ἐπιστολῶν, οὐχ ὅλων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνίων, ὧν ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς πάσης πραγματείας αἱ ὀνομασίαι ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐνετάχθησαν, ὡς παρ᾽ αὐτῷ τὸ Ἀποστολικὸν ἐμφέρεται. Καὶ αὐτῶν δὲ ἠκροτηριασμένων συνήθως τῇ αὐτοῦ ῥαδιουργίᾳ· ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ προταχθέντι*

ὀνόματι Εὐαγγελίῳ λείψανα μὲν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθῆ λέγειν· ὅμως δὲ τὰ πάντα δεινῶς μηχανευσάμενος ἐνόθευσεν.

Ibid. p. 321. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 726.) *Αὕτη ἡ νενοθευμένη τοῦ Μαρκίωνος σύνταξις, ἔχουσα μὲν χαρακτῆρα καὶ τύπον τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ Παύλου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου οὐχ ὅλον, οὐ πασῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ Ἐπιστολῶν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, καὶ πρὸς Κολοσσεῖς, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Γαλάτας, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Φιλήμονα, καὶ Φιλιππησίους, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας, καὶ πρὸς Τίτον, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τῶν ἐμφερομένων παρ' αὐτῷ, ὡς οὐ πληρεστάτων οὐσῶν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν παραχαράξει. Πανταχόθεν δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν σύνταξιν ἐῤῥᾳδιουργημένην, καὶ ἔν τισι λέξεσιν ἐπιποιήτως προθήκην ἔχουσαν, οὐκ εἰς ὠφέλειαν, ἀλλὰ εἰς ὕσσονας καὶ ἐπιβλαβεῖς ξενολεξίας κατὰ τῆς ὑγιοῦς πίστεως, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐμβεβροντημένου τοῦ βοσκήματος.*[1]

MARCION'S APOSTOLICON.

[Marcion's changes on the Ten Pauline Epistles in his Apostolicon may be thus represented.

Galatians I. 1. Καὶ Θεοῦ Πατρός omitted (Jerome). And apparently ἑαυτόν for αὐτόν.

7. Κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου inserted after ἄλλο. Εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ after μεταστρέψαι, instead of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Dial. de recta fide p. 9. (This, however, may not have been by Marcion, though quoted by a Marcionite.)

III. 6-9. 14. 16-18 omitted (?).

(Tert. Adv. Marc. V. 3. says on v. 26 — *Sed et cum adjicit: Omnes enim filii estis fidei, ostenditur quid supra haeretica industria eraserit, mentionem scilicet Abrahae, qua nos apostolus filios Abrahae per fidem affirmat, secundum quam mentionem hic quoque filios fidei notavit.* It seems from this as if all mention of Abraham were omitted. Lardner (IV. 619) conjectures that Marc. omitted from III. 14 to IV. 3; so as to

[1] This is a mistake, as Epiphanius (see before, p. 394) and others tell us that Marcion had only Ten Epistles in his Ἀποστολικόν. This list is also curious in enumerating both Ephesians and Laodiceans. It is possible that in Tertullian's time Ephesians was in Marcion's Canon as 'Laodiceans;' while in the later days of Epiphanius, there were some fragments added to the Apostolicon called 'Laodiceans.' As appears in the text, below, Tertullian did not find some of the Epistles in Marcion's book so completely corrupted as Epiphanius found them.

read: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men—when we were yet children," &c. Tert. reads this in Adv. Marc. IV. 1; but the quotation from III. 26 makes Lardner's supposition untenable. Marcion may have repeated "when we were yet children" at IV. 3.)

V. 9. δολοῖ for ζυμοῖ. Epiph. Sch. 4 (on Gal.) p. 351. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 776.)

1 Corinthians. IX. 8. Εἰ καὶ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως ταῦτα οὐ λέγει for Καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει. Epiph. p. 321. (Migne p. 721.) (Epiph. says afterwards (Sch. 7 and 15. p 355) that the change was the insertion of Μωϋσέως in the next clause, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ.)

X. 9. Χριστόν for Κύριον. Ibid. p. 358. (Migne p. 788.) (This is the reading in many old MSS.)

19. ἱερόθυτον for εἰδωλόθυτον. Ibid.

XIV. 19. διὰ τὸν νόμον for τῷ νοΐ μου. Ibid. p. 361. (Migne p. 792.)

[*Note.* In 1 Cor. xv. 38 the Marcionite had πνεῦμα for σῶμα; and omitted 38 (b)—42 (a) and introduced 44 before 42 (b). In v. 45 Κύριος for Ἀδάμ, and omitted ἄνθρωπος in the latter clause. So at least it appears in Dial. de recta fide, pp. 864, 868.]

2 Cor. IV. 13. omitted κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον. Epiph. p. 367. (Migne p. 801.)

Romans. Omitted chapters XV. XVI. (Origen, Can. in Rom. lib. X. p. 687. Migne, p. 1290. Only in the Latin of Rufinus.)

1 and 2 Thess Epiphanius says that the whole was so corrupted by Marcion that he made no quotation: p. 371. Migne (p. 807).

Tert. V. 15 says Marcion added ἰδίους in 1 Thess. ii. 15 (but this is in many MSS). He also says, V. 16, that Marcion omitted ἐν πυρὶ φλογός (2 Thess. ii. 8).

Ephesians (called Laodiceans). Epiphanius (p. 372, Migne p. 809) says that in Eph. v. 31 Marcion omitted τῇ γυναικί. Tertullian (c. 17) also notices, ii. 15, the omission of αὐτοῦ after σαρκί; ii. 20, omission of προφητῶν. iii. 9, omitted ἐν (apparently under the idea that it would then read "hidden *from* God").

Colossians. No distinct charge of alteration made against Marcion.

Philemon. Tert. V. 21 says Marcion altered every Epistle save Philemon; but Epiphanius says it was wholly depraved by Marcion.

Philippians. Epiphanius says this also was hopelessly corrupted. Tertullian quotes some passages, and makes no specific charge of corruption.

Epiphanius (p. 374, Migne p. 812) gives as an extract from what he found appended to the Apostolicon from the so-called "Laodiceans" what (as he says) is equivalent to Eph. iv. 5, but with the addition of εἷς Χριστός after βάπτισμα.

The Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews were rejected by Marcion.

The foregoing shows that Marcion's changes on such Pauline Epistles as he received were few; and that his omissions were few and (save from Gal. iii. and Romans xv. and xvi.) unimportant. It is impossible to reconcile Romans, as he allowed it to be, with his system—or even the mutilated Galatians.]

6. Carpocrates.[1]

Iren. B. I. 25. 1. Carpocrates autem et qui ab eo mundum quidem et ea, quae in eo sunt, ab angelis multo inferioribus ingenito Patre factum esse dicunt. Jesum autem e Joseph natum, et quum similis reliquis hominibus fuerit, distasse a reliquis secundum id, quod anima ejus firma et munda quum esset, commemorata fuerit, quae visa essent sibi in ea circumlatione, quae fuisset ingenito Deo; et propter hoc ab eo missam esse ei virtutem, uti mundi fabricatores effugere posset et per omnes transgressa et in omnibus liberata ascenderet ad eum; et eas, quae similia ei amplectarentur, similiter.

Ibid. 2. Ea[m] igitur quae similiter atque illa Jesu anima, potest contemnere mundi fabricatores archontas, similiter accipere virtutes ad operandum similia. Quapropter et ad tantum elationis provecti sunt, ut quidam quidem similes sese dicant Jesu; quidam autem adhuc et secundum aliquid illo fortiores, qui sunt distantes amplius quam illius discipuli, ut puta quam Petrus et Paulus et reliqui apostoli; hos autem in nullo deminorari a Jesu. . . . . Si quis autem plus quam ille contemserit ea quae sunt hic, posse meliorem quam illum esse.

Ibid. 4. Et in tantam insaniam effraenati sunt (sc. Carpocratiani), uti et omnia quaecunque sunt irreligiosa et impia, in potestate habere et operari se dicant. Sola enim humana opinione negotia mala et bona dicunt. Et utique secundum trans-

[1] Carpocrates. The most biographical account of Carpocrates is in Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 2. p. 511. There is a long account of his doctrine in Irenaeus, B. I. 25, which Hippolytus reproduces (Haer. VII. 32); and Epiphanius (Haer. 27) expands. See also references in Iren. B. II. 31 and following chapters. He was a contemporary of Basilides. He seems to have taught a doctrine of human perfectibility; and some of his followers claimed to be of higher spiritual attainments than the Apostles. This easily led to Antinomianism, and practical immorality, especially of the sexual kind. According to Clement, their principles were of the most licentious character. Their relation to the Scriptures is not easily established; but the natural inference from the arguments of Clement and Irenaeus is, that they accepted the New Testament. See Rom. iii. 20, vii. 7, and Mat. v. 28, quoted in Clement, by himself or by them, as of admitted authority. Clement's chapter is not one that can be easily quoted here. At all events, rejection of the New Testament is not charged against them; and the extract from Epiphanius in our text shows that they accepted Matthew's Gospel with some excision. It will be seen that Irenaeus speaks of the Carpocratians as claiming the title of Gnostics, while Hippolytus says it was the Naassenes who first claimed it.

migrationes in corpora oportere in omni vita et in omni actu fieri animas: . . . uti, secundum quod scripta eorum dicunt, in omni usu vitae factae animae ipsorum, exeuntes, in nihilo adhuc minus habeant, ad operandum (autem) in eo: ne forte, propterea quod deest libertati aliqua res, cogantur iterum mitti in corpus. Propter hoc dicunt Jesum hanc dixisse parabolam: *Cum es cum adversario tuo in via, da operam, ut libereris ab eo, ne forte te det judici, et judex ministro, et mittat te in carcerem. Amen dico tibi, non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem.* (Mat. v. 25; Luke xii. 58.) Et adversarium dicunt unum ex angelis, qui sunt in mundo, quem diabolum vocant, dicentes factum eum ad id, ut ducat eas, quae perierunt, animas a mundo ad principem: (et hunc dicunt esse primum ex mundi fabricatoribus) et illum alterum angelo, qui ministrat ei, tradere tales animas, uti in alia corpora includat: corpus enim dicunt esse carcerem. Et id quod ait: *Non exies inde, quoadusque novissimum quadrantem reddas,* interpretantur, quasi non exeat quis a potestate angelorum eorum, qui mundum fabricaverunt; sic transcorporatum semper, quoadusque in omni omnino operatione, quae in mundo est, fiat: et quum nil defuerit ei, tum liberatam ejus animam eliberari ad illum Deum, qui est supra angelos mundi fabricatores. Sic quoque salvari et omnes animas, sive ipsae praeoccupantes in uno adventu in omnibus misceantur operationibus, sive de corpore in corpus transmigrantes, vel immissae in unaquaque specie vitae adimplentes, et reddentes debita liberari, uti jam non faciant in corpore. (Mat. v. 25; Luke xii. 58.)

Ibid. 6. Gnosticos se autem vocant; et imagines quasdam quidem depictas, quasdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicentes formam Christi factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jesus cum hominibus.

Epiph. Haer. B. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 138. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 429.) *Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς, τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι δῆθεν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας, βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗτοι δὲ ἄλλα τινὰ διανοοῦνται. Παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλο-*

γίας ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι ὡς προεῖπον, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασίλεως, κ.τ.λ.[2]

7. Valentinus.[1]

Irenaeus, B. 1. *Praef.* 2. (Irenaeus says that he was induced to write by falling in with the writings of the disciples of Valentinus.) Ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην, ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δ' αὐτῶν καὶ συμβαλὼν καὶ καταλαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν, μηνῦσαί σοι, ἀγαπητέ, τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια, ἃ οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν, ἐπεὶ μὴ πάντες τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐξεπτύκασιν (al. ἐσχήκασιν).

Ibid. B. I. 11. 1. (Irenaeus knew the writings of Valentinus himself.) Ἴδωμεν νῦν καὶ τὴν τούτων ἄστατον γνώμην, δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων, πῶς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐναντία ἀποφαίνονται. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας Οὐαλεντῖνος οὕτως ἐξηροφόρησεν, κ.τ.λ. (Here follows the Pleroma according to Valentinus) § 2. Σεκοῦνδος λέγει, κ.τ.λ. (Here follows the Pleroma according to Secundus) § 3. Ἄλλος . . . ἐπὶ τὸ ὑψηλότερον καὶ

[2] This seems to mean that the followers of Cerinthus and Carpocrates used the Gospel of Matthew without cutting off the genealogies, while the Ebionites cut off the genealogies altogether.

[1] Valentinus was a contemporary of Justin Martyr, and was in Rome during the Episcopate of Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus (Iren. B. III. 4. 3). According to Clement of Alexandria he claimed Theodas, a disciple of Paul, as his teacher. The date A.D. 140-160 represents the close of his life. He accepted the whole New Testament, but perverted it by fanciful interpretations. He developed the theory of emanations with great completeness. His central thought was that God, in realising His own Being, created the universe. He who dwelt in the eternal silence needed some object to love,—needed creation to which His attributes might flow out. The Beings thus made produced others, and, in the course of evolution, the existence of the material world and the Christian redemption came about. His 30 Aeons made the Pleroma. He tried to find support in Scripture for his speculations, but, as Hippolytus says, he was a Pythagorean first and a Christian afterwards. His eclecticism drew from Persian, Egyptian, Jewish, and (it would appear) Indian thought. By putting in many stages between God and evil, he fancied he had accounted for the origin of evil and the origin of matter. The result was a system of philosophy in which salvation consists of education; in which free-will (the cardinal fact of human consciousness) finds no rightful place; and in which no Aeon bears the name of Repentance. But it appealed, not without success, to the mass of mankind, while Basilides spoke for the learned.

γνωστικώτερον ἐπεκτεινόμενος, κ.τ.λ. (Here follows the outline of another disciple's system.)

Ibid. B. III. 11. 7. (*The followers of Valentinus made specially copious use of John's Gospel.*) Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes, &c. See before, p. 67.

Ibid. B. III. 11. 9. (*The followers of Valentinus made a Gospel unlike the Apostolic Gospels, and called it the Gospel of Truth.*) Hi vero, qui sunt a Valentino, &c. See before, p. 70.

Ibid. B. III. 12. 12. (*The Valentinians, like all heretics except Marcion and his followers, accepted the Scriptures.*) Reliqui vero omnes falso scientiae nomine inflati, Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt, quemadmodum ostendimus in primo libro.[2]

Ibid. B. I. 8. 1. (*The Valentinians claimed also to have traditional doctrine.*) *Τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν οὔσης, ἣν οὔτε προφῆται ἐκήρυξαν, οὔτε ὁ Κύριος ἐδίδαξεν, οὔτε ἀπόστολοι παρέδωκαν, ἣν περὶ τῶν ὅλων αὐχοῦσι πλεῖον τῶν ἄλλων ἐγνωκέναι, ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες, καὶ, τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον, ἐξ ἄμμου σχοινία πλέκειν ἐπιτηδεύοντες, ἀξιόπιστα προσαρμόζειν πειρῶνται τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἤτοι παραβολὰς κυριακάς, ἢ ῥήσεις προφητικάς, ἢ λόγους ἀποστολικούς, ἵνα τὸ πλάσμα αὐτῶν μὴ ἁμάρτυρον εἶναι δοκῇ.*[3]

Ibid. B. I. 3. 6. (*The way they perverted the Scriptures.*) *Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιεῖσθαι, παρατρέποντες τὰς ἑρμηνείας, καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν, ἅ τε πολλῶν παραβολῶν καὶ ἀλληγοριῶν εἰρημένων καὶ εἰς πολλὰ ἕλκειν δυναμένων τὸ ἀμφίβολον διὰ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως, ἕτεροι δὲ δεινῶς τῷ πλάσματι αὐτῶν.*

[2] Compare what Tertullian says below.

[3] It is clear from this that the Valentinians accepted the Scriptures, but alleged that through tradition they had attained to a truth which enabled them rightly to interpret Scripture. Irenaeus says the same thing even more explicitly in B. III. 2. 1, where he quotes the Valentinians as saying that without their tradition truth is not attainable. They also objected (B. III. 2. 2) to the orthodox tradition preserved in the Churches. *Evenit itaque, neque Scripturis jam neque traditioni consentire eos.* But this does not mean (Sup. Rel. II. 76, complete edition) that they "rejected the writings of the N. T. as authoritative documents." They made both Scripture and ordinary Church doctrine bend to their speculations.

EXAMPLES OF VALENTINIAN QUOTATION OR INTERPRETATION.

Irenaeus, B. I. 3. 2. Ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν προηγουμένων τοῦ ὀνόματος[4] αὐτοῦ δύο γραμμάτων, τοῦ τε ἰῶτα, καὶ τοῦ ἦτα, τοὺς δεκαοκτὼ αἰῶνας εἰσήμως μηνύεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς δέκα αἰῶνας ὡσαύτως διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα γράμματος, ὃ προηγεῖται τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, σημαίνουσι λέγεσθαι (al. σημαίνεσθαι λέγουσι). Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, ἰῶτα ἓν, ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται. (Mat. v. 18.)[5]

Ibid. I. 3. 5. Ἔπειτα περὶ τοῦ Ὅρου αὐτῶν, ὃν δὴ καὶ πλείοσιν ὀνόμασι καλοῦσι, δύο ἐνεργείας ἔχειν αὐτὸν ἀποφαινόμενοι, τὴν ἑδραστικὴν καὶ τὴν μερικήν· καὶ καθὸ μὲν ἑδράζει καὶ στηρίζει, Σταυρὸν εἶναι, καθὸ δὲ μερίζει καὶ διορίζει, Ὅρον· τὸν μὲν Σταυρὸν [al. Σωτῆρα] οὕτως λέγουσι μεμηνυκέναι τὰς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦ· καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἑδραστικὴν ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν· Ὃς οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, μαθητὴς ἐμὸς οὐ δύναται γενέσθαι. Καί· Ἄρας τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ ἀκολούθει μοι. Τὴν δὲ διοριστικὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν.[6] (Mat. x. 34.)

Ibid. B. I. 8. 5. (*The Valentinians and John's Gospel.*) Ἔτι δὲ Ἰωάννην τὸν μαθητὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διδάσκουσι τὴν πρώτην ὀγδοάδα μεμηνυκέναι αὐταῖς λέξεσι, λέγοντες οὕτως· Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου βουλόμενος εἰπεῖν τὴν τῶν ὅλων γένεσιν, καθ' ἣν τὰ πάντα προέβαλεν ὁ Πατὴρ, ἀρχήν τινα ὑποτίθεται τὸ πρῶτον γεννηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν δὴ καὶ υἱὸν Μονογενῆ καὶ Θεὸν κέκληκεν ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ὁ Πατὴρ προέβαλε σπερματικῶς. Ὑπὸ δὲ τούτου φησὶ τὸν Λόγον προβεβλῆσθαι καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν ὅλην τῶν Αἰώνων οὐσίαν, ἣν αὐτὸς ὕστερον ἐμόρφωσεν ὁ Λόγος. Ἐπεὶ οὖν περὶ πρώτης γενέσεως λέγει, καλῶς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς, τουτέστι[7] τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, τὴν διδασκαλίαν ποιεῖται. Λέγει δὲ οὕτως· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν

[4] The first letter of this name of Jesus (I) being = 10; the second (H) being = 8.

[5] See also Hippol. Ref. Haer. VI. 24.

[6] We give this as a specimen of the interpretations by which the Valentinians tortured the most unlikely passages of Scripture to support their speculations. The boundary or fence of the Pleroma was called Stauros or Horos, in order that they might explain such passages as 1 Cor. i. 18; Gal. vi. 14. (See passage below.) In the present case the use of the two names is defended because of the twofold function of confirmation and division.

[7] The Latin translates: "τουτέστι τοῦ υἱοῦ."

Θεὸν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος· οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Πρότερον διαστείλας τὰ τρία, Θεὸν, καὶ Ἀρχὴν, καὶ Λόγον, πάλιν αὐτὰ ἑνοῖ, ἵνα καὶ τὴν προβολὴν ἑκατέρων αὐτῶν δείξῃ, τοῦ τε Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἅμα, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Πατέρα ἕνωσιν. . . . Λέγει δὲ οὕτως· Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρὸς, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. Ἀκριβῶς οὖν καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἐμήνυσε τετράδα· Πατέρα εἰπὼν, καὶ Χάριν καὶ τὸν Μονογενῆ καὶ Ἀλήθειαν. Οὗτος ὁ Ἰωάννης περὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ μητρὸς τῶν ὅλων Αἰώνων ὀγδοάδος εἴρηκε. Πατέρα γὰρ εἴρηκε, καὶ Χάριν καὶ Μονογενῆ καὶ Ἀλήθειαν καὶ Λόγον καὶ Ζωὴν καὶ Ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν.[8] (John i.)

Ibid. B. I. 3. 1. (*The Valentinians used Paul's Epistles.*) *Καὶ τὸν Παῦλον φανερώτατα λέγουσι τούσδε Αἰῶνας ὀνομάζειν πολλάκις, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν τετηρηκέναι οὕτως εἰπόντα· Εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων τοῦ αἰῶνος.* (Eph. iii. 21.)

Ibid. B. I. 3. 4. *Καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου δὲ φανερῶς διὰ τοῦτο εἰρῆσθαι λέγουσι· Καὶ αὐτός ἐστι τὰ πάντα· καὶ πάλιν· Πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα· καὶ πάλιν· Ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος· καὶ τό· Ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἑρμηνεύουσιν εἰρῆσθαι, καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα.* (Col. iii. 9. 11; Rom. xi. 36; Eph. i. 10.)

Ibid. B. I. 3. 5. *Παῦλον δὲ τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιμιμήσκεσθαι τούτου τοῦ σταυροῦ λέγουσιν, οὕτως· Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστὶ, τοῖς δὲ σῳζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις Θεοῦ· καὶ πάλιν· Ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο ἐν μηδενὶ καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ.* (1 Cor. i. 18; Gal. vi. 14.)

Clem. Alex. Strom. II. 20. p. 488. *Ἀλλὰ καὶ Οὐαλεντῖνος πρός τινας ἐπιστέλλων αὐταῖς λέξεσι γράφει περὶ τῶν προσαρτημάτων· Εἷς δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, οὗ παῤῥησία ἡ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φανέρωσις, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου δύναιτο ἂν ἡ καρδία καθαρὰ γενέσθαι παντὸς πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἐξωθουμένου τῆς καρδίας.* (Mat. xix. 17; v. 8 (?).

[8] In the Latin is added after "Ecclesiam": *et Ptolemaeus quidem ita.* There are similar interpretations of John i. 18 in Irenaeus, B. I. 8. 5.

Ibid. VII. 17. p. 898. (*After saying that Basilides claimed Glaucias as his teacher, Clement adds:*) Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Οὐαλεντῖνον Θεοδᾶ διακηκοέναι φέρουσιν· γνώριμος δ' οὗτος γεγόνει Παύλου.

Tertullian de praescript. haeret. c. 30. Item Valentinus, aliter exponens, et sine dubio emendans, hoc omnino (*al.* nomine) quicquid emendat, ut mendosum retro, anterius fuisse demonstrat.

Ibid. c. 37. (See before, p. 48.)

Ibid. c. 38. Alius manu scripturas, alius sensu expositiones intervertit. Neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exserte et palam machaera, non stilo usus est, quoniam ad materiam suam caedem scripturarum confecit, Valentinus autem pepercit, quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas excogitavit: et tamen plus abstulit et plus adjecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum, et adjiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum.

Origen, c. Cels. II. 27. Μεταχαράξαντας δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἄλλους οὐκ οἶδα, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Λουκάνου.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VI. 29. (*p.* 270.) (*Valentinus a Pythagorean and a Platonist rather than a Christian philosopher.*) Τοιαύτη τις, ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίοις εἰπεῖν ἐπελθόντα, ἡ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος συνέστηκε δόξα, ἀφ' ἧς Οὐαλεντῖνος, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὴν αἵρεσιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ συναγαγών, ὡς ἐπιδείξομεν, δικαίως Πυθαγορικὸς καὶ Πλατωνικός, οὐ Χριστιανὸς λογισθείη. Οὐαλεντῖνος τοίνυν καὶ Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τούτων σχολή, οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος μαθηταὶ ἀκολουθήσαντες τοῖς καθηγησαμένοις, ἀριθμητικὴν τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν κατεβάλοντο.

Ibid. VI. 34. (*p.* 284). Τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐν τῇ γραφῇ· Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα καὶ Κύριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἵνα δώῃ ὑμῖν ὁ Θεὸς κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον τουτέστι τὸν ψυχικὸν οὐ τὸν σωματικὸν ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε νοῆσαι τί τὸ βάθος ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων καὶ τί τὸ πλάτος ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ σταυ-

ρὸς, ὁ ὅρος τοῦ πληρώματος ἢ τί τὸ μῆκος τουτέστι τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν αἰώνων.[9] (Eph. iii. 14, 16-18.)

Ibid. Διὰ τοῦτο ψυχικὸς, φησὶν, ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστί. (1 Cor. ii. 14.)

Ibid. Γεγέννηται ὁ Ἰησοῦς διὰ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ· πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἡ σοφία· καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· ὕψιστός ἐστιν ὁ δημιουργός· διὸ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται. (Luke i. 35.)[10]

Ibid. VI. 35. (*p.* 284.) Πάντες οὖν οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, μωροῦ λέγει Θεοῦ, μωροὶ οὐδὲν εἰδότες. Διὰ τοῦτο, φησὶ, λέγει ὁ Σωτήρ· Πάντες οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐληλυθότες κλέπται καὶ λῃσταὶ εἰσί. (John x. 8.)[11]

[9] See echoes VI. 35 (Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 9); VI. 30 (Heb. xii. 22); VI. 29 (1 John iv. 8).

[10] This passage is clearly from St Luke, though it is not verbatim, υἱὸς Θεοῦ being omitted. The words ἐκ σοῦ are not genuine, but they are a very old and respectably supported addition for which the Peshito and a, c, e, m of O. L. can be cited. See Sanday's able argument using this as a proof of the antiquity of the Gospel, inasmuch as it had time to be corrupted before this Gnostic cited it. On this passage the Valentinians were divided, Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, as leading the Italian branch, declaring that the body of Jesus was ψυχικόν, while Axionicus and Bardesanes, as representing the Eastern branch, said it was πνευματικόν. The question however arises, whether Hippolytus in his text is quoting the founder of the school, or some follower. It is impossible to say with perfect certainty, but, unless Valentinus was a myth, he must have been the leader of the Valentinians, and it is unreasonable to ask us to believe that he had none of those quotations which his followers founded so much upon. The same question arises here as upon Basilides, and the φησί of Hippolytus is ambiguous in both cases. Canon Westcott in his fourth edition withdraws further than is necessary from his former position, maintaining that the citations are by Valentinus himself. The way in which Hippolytus first quotes this passage from the representative of the school and afterwards refers to the disputes between the two branches, makes us think that he is quoting the founder—the disputes being of later date. He resumes in c. 36 with ἐπιλέγει. But even if this be not admitted, the citation is at all events by an early Valentinian—long before Hippolytus, and not later than Irenaeus, whose contemporary Heracleon was. The quotation is not later than 150-180 A.D.—and the text must be much earlier.

[11] In regard to the citations of John's Gospel there is of course the already noticed ambiguity of φησί. Was the writer Valentinus or a follower? Baur and others say that the Fourth Gospel adopted its phrases from Valentinus; but when Hippol. IV. 51 compares the Hebdomad of Simon, — νοῦς, ἐπίνοια, ὄνομα, φωνή, λογισμός, ἐνθύμησις, ὁ ἑστὼς στὰς στησόμενος, — with Valentinus's νοῦς, ἀλήθεια, λόγος, ζωή, ἄνθρωπος, ἐκκλησία, ὁ πατήρ, he leads the reader to accept his statement that the whole school of Valentinus used and founded upon the Fourth Gospel from which its fundamental terms were drawn. Heracleon's Commentary would not have needed to twist John's Gospel if one of the school had written it. The simple use of the terms by the Evangelist must be the original; the distortion by the philosophers is a subsequent stage. See Iren. I. 8, I. 9, I. 10.

Ibid. (*p.* 286.) *Τοῦτο ἐστὶ, φησὶ, τὸ εἰρημένον· Ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, ἤτοι ψυχικά.* (Rom. viii. 11.)

Ibid. VIII. 10. (*p.* 422.) *Τοῦτό ἐστι, φησὶν, ὃ λέγει ὁ Σωτήρ· Ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅτι τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν.* (John iii. 5, 6.)

Ibid. IX. 12. (*p.* 458.) *Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ εἰρημένον· Οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί;* (John xiv. 11.)[1,2]

8. Heracleon.[1]

Irenaeus. B. II. 4. 1. (*Heracleon was a Valentinian.*) Si autem non prolatum est, sed a se generatum est: et simile est et fraternum et ejusdem honoris id, quod est Vacuum, si Patri, qui praedictus est a Valentino; antiquius autem et multo ante existens et honorificentius reliquis Aeonibus ipsius Ptolemaei et Heracleonis et reliquis omnibus qui eadem opinantur.[2]

Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. 9. *p.* 595. (*Heracleon the most distinguished Valentinian.*) *Ἡρακλέων ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος.*

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VI. 35. (*p.* 286.) (*Heracleon of the Italian school of Valentinians.*) *Οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέων*

See good remarks in Bleek, N. T. Int. § 86. See also Westcott, Canon, p. 296 (4th edition).

[1,2] See also echoes of John's Gospel vi. 32 (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου).

[1] Heracleon. There is no doubt about Heracleon having quoted the Gospels of Luke and John and 2 Timothy as seen in our text. He quoted also Matthew, Romans, and 1 Corinthians (see Westcott, Canon). Origen quotes his commentary on John more than 50 times; commenting indeed in many passages quite as much on Heracleon as on John. We have quoted the principal references to his date and position, and a few passages to illustrate his mode of teaching. His minute care of the letter of Scripture is visible in these passages. He was, so far as is known, the first commentator on the New Testament. He wrote a commentary on John, and we have at least a fragmentary comment of his upon Luke. His date is therefore of importance. See note 1 on Ptolemaeus (below p. 422). He quoted the book called 'Peter's Preaching,' and Origen refers to this quotation when discussing the character of true worship as declared in John iv. 22. (Origen, Comment. in Joann. t. 13. p. 226. Migne, Vol. IV. p. 424.) The passage itself is found and discussed in Clem. Strom. VI. 5. 39-43. p. 759.

[2] The only mention of Heracleon by Irenaeus; who thus mentions him among the Valentinians in course of an argument to show that in constructing the world the Gnostics of that school had not provided for the origin of κένωμα (or *Vacuitas*, or Vacuum).

καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ψυχικόν φασι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γεγονέναι. . . . Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς λέγουσιν, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἀξιόνικος καὶ Ἀρδησιάνης, ὅτι πνευματικὸν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος.

Ibid. VI. 29. (*p.* 270). (*Heracleon a follower of Greek Philosophy.*) *Οὐαλεντῖνος τοίνυν καὶ Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τοῦτων σχολὴ, οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος μαθηταὶ, ἀκολουθήσαντες τοῖς καθηγησαμένοις, ἀριθμητικὴν τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν κατεβάλοντο.*

Origen, Comment. in Joann. Tom. II. p. 66. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 137.) (*Heracleon reported to be specially connected with Valentinus.*) *Τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον*[3] *Ἡρακλέωνα, διηγούμενον τὸ Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.*

Epiph. Haeres. I. t. 3. *h.* 36, *p.* 262. (Migne, Vol. I *p.* 633.) *Ἡρακλέων τις τοῦτον τὸν Κολόρβασον διαδέχεται.*[4]

SPECIMENS OF THE WRITINGS OF HERACLEON.

Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. 9. *p.* 595. *Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρός μου ἐν οὐρανοῖς.* (Mat. x. 32.) *Ὅταν δὲ φέρωσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε πῶς ἀπολογηθῆτε, ἢ τί εἴπητε· τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί δεῖ εἰπεῖν.* (Luke xii. 11, 12.[5]) *Τοῦτον ἐξηγούμενος τὸν τόπον, Ἡρακλέων ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος κατὰ λέξιν φησὶν ὁμολογίαν εἶναι τὴν μὲν ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ πολιτείᾳ, τὴν δὲ ἐν φωνῇ.*

[3] There is doubt as to the meaning of γνώριμος—probably it is "special friend" or "special pupil."

[4] Epiphanius makes Marcus "succeed Secundus and Epiphanes and Ptolemaeus and Valentinus" (Haer. 34), and Colarbasus (Haer. 35) succeed Marcus, whose "fellow-disciple he was" (Analysis of Tom. 3). He next makes Heracleon succeed Colarbasus, as in our text. But he is confused and inaccurate. It appears that he and others mistook a (probably corrupt) passage of Irenaeus, and changed the Tetrad which began the Pleroma of Marcus, (the Hebrew name of which was Col-Arba, the Voice of Four) into the name of a heretic, Colarbasus, round whose mythical name gradually grew a collection of strange doctrines he was supposed to have taught! See Hort's article "Colarbasus" in Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography for a good account. In Haer. 41 Epiphanius makes Heracleon precede Cerdo), who flourished about A.D. 140.

[5] This is the only reference to Heracleon's Commentary on Luke. Clement does not mention his Commentary on John, from which Origen quotes very often without mentioning that on Luke. Hippolytus mentions neither.

Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν φωνῇ ὁμολογία καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξουσιῶν γίνεται, ἣν μόνην, φησὶν, ὁμολογίαν ἡγοῦνται εἶναι οἱ πολλοὶ οὐχ ὑγιῶς, δύνανται δὲ ταύτην τὴν ὁμολογίαν καὶ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ὁμολογεῖν. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ εὑρεθήσεται οὗτος ὁ λόγος καθολικῶς εἰρημένος· οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογίαν καὶ ἐξῆλθον, ἐξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Θωμᾶς, Λευΐς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί. Καί ἐστιν ἡ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογία οὐ καθολικὴ ἀλλὰ μερική· καθολικὴ δὲ ἣν νῦν λέγει τὴν ἐν ἔργοις καὶ πράξεσι καταλλήλοις τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως. Ἕπεται δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ ἡ μερικὴ ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξουσιῶν, ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ ὁ λόγος αἴρῃ· ὁμολογῆσει γὰρ οὗτος καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ὀρθῶς προομολογήσας πρότερον τῇ διαθέσει. Καὶ καλῶς ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὁμολογούντων, "ἐν ἐμοι" εἶπεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀρνουμένων τὸ "ἐμὲ" προσέθηκεν. Οὗτοι γὰρ κἂν τῇ φωνῇ ὁμολογήσωσιν αὐτὸν, ἀρνοῦνται αὐτὸν τῇ πράξει μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, μόνοι δ᾽ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ πράξει βιοῦντες, ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἐνειλημμένος αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐχόμενος ὑπὸ τούτων, διόπερ "ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν οὐδέποτε δύναται." (2 Tim. ii. 13.) *Ἀρνοῦνται δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὴ ὄντες ἐν αὐτῷ· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, "ὃς ἀρνήσηται ἐν ἐμοὶ," ἀλλ᾽ "ἐμέ·" οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε ὢν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀρνεῖται αὐτόν. Τὸ δὲ "ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων" καὶ τῶν σωζομένων καὶ τῶν ἐθνικῶν δὲ ὁμοίως παρ᾽ οἷς μὲν καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ, παρ᾽ οἷς δὲ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ. Διόπερ ἀρνήσασθαι αὐτὸν οὐδέποτε δύνανται, ἀρνοῦνται δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὴ ὄντες ἐν αὐτῷ." Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἡρακλέων.*

Origen, Comment. in Joann. Tom. II. p. 66. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 137.) *Βιαίως δὲ οἶμαι καὶ χωρὶς μαρτυρίου, τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα διηγούμενον τό· Πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ἐξειληφέναι πάντα τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐκκλείοντα τῶν πάντων τὸ ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποθέσει αὐτοῦ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ διαφέροντα. Φησὶ γὰρ, οἱ τὸν αἰῶνα ἢ τὰ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι γεγονέναι διὰ τοῦ Λόγου, ἅτινα οἴεται πρὸ τοῦ Λόγου γεγονέναι. Ἀναιδέστερον δὲ ἱστάμενος πρὸς τό· Καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν· μὴ εὐλαβούμενος τὸ, "Μὴ προσθῇς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐλέγξῃ σε, καὶ ψευδὴς γένῃ," προστίθησι τῷ· οὐδὲ ἓν, τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ τῇ κτίσει.* (John i.)

Ibid. Tom. VI. p. 130. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 251.) *Ὁ μὲν*

Ἡρακλέων οἴεται, ὅτι ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰωάννης τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων πεμφθεῖσιν, οὐ πρὸς ὃ ἐκεῖνοι ἐπηρώτων, ἀλλ' ὃ αὐτὸς ἐβούλετο· ἑαυτὸν λανθάνων, ὅτι κατηγορεῖ τοῦ προφήτου ἀμαθίας, εἴγε ἄλλο ἐρωτώμενος περὶ ἄλλου ἀποκρίνεται.

Ibid. Tom. XX. p. 339. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 628.) [*Ὁ Ἡρακλέων*] *πάλιν εἰς τό· τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν, διαστέλλεται λέγων, τὸν διάβολον μὴ ἔχειν θέλημα, ἀλλ' ἐπιθυμίας.* (John viii. 44), *καὶ ἐμφαίνεται αὐτόθεν τὸ ἀδιανόητον τοῦ λόγου· θέλειν γὰρ τὰ πονηρὰ πᾶς ἄν τις ὁμολογήσαι ἐκεῖνον. . . . Μετὰ ταῦτά φησι ὁ Ἡρακλέων ὡς ἄρα ταῦτα εἴρηται οὐ πρὸς τοὺς φύσει τοῦ διαβόλου υἱοὺς, τοὺς χοϊκοὺς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς ψυχικοὺς θέσει υἱοὺς διαβόλου γενομένους· ἀφ' ὧν τῇ φύσει δύνανταί τινες καὶ θέσει υἱοὶ Θεοῦ χρηματίσαι.*

9. Ptolemaeus.[1]

Irenaeus, B. I. Praef. § 2. (*Ptolemaeus a pupil of Valentinus.*) *Καὶ καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν.*

[1] There is not much difficulty in regard to the use made by Ptolemaeus of the New Testament. There is no good reason to doubt the genuineness of his 'Letter to Flora,' in which are references to Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, Corinthians and Ephesians. In Irenaeus we find that he also referred to Galatians and Colossians. The difficulty in estimating his testimony arises from doubt as to his date. Irenaeus in Books I. II. of his great work mentions Ptolemaeus often, and once he names Heracleon along with him. Irenaeus wrote those books not later than A.D. 182. The author of 'Supernatural Religion' finds in Epiphanius and in the 'Chronicon Paschale' grounds for believing that Theodotion's translation of the O. T. (which Irenaeus quotes in Book III.) was not published till A.D. 184. But we have to do with Books I. and II. and need not discuss the value of the argument drawn from such sources. Irenaeus seems to have personally known some of the leading Valentinians in Rome A.D. 178 (see his Preface to Ref. Haer. § 2), and, as Ptolemaeus and Heracleon were of the "Italian" school (see Hippolytus in our text), it is probable that he met Ptolemaeus, who had founded a school before the time Irenaeus was in Rome. So much for Irenaeus. But we find from Clement and Origen that Heracleon was in some special way the pupil of Valentinus, and the most distinguished of his school. If so, he must have been the contemporary of his master during part at least of his life. The activity of Valentinus (A.D. 140-160) is therefore at the latest time when Heracleon probably avowed his attachment to John's Gospel, on which he afterwards wrote a commentary. Any other supposition destroys all idea of the continuity of the school of Valentinus. But that continuity is one of the best attested facts in the early history of Christianity. We may conclude therefore that by the middle of the second century this school agreed with the orthodox Christians in accepting the Gospels.

Tertullian, Adv. Valent. c. 4. (*Ptolemaeus and Heracleon only carried out the views of Valentinus.*) Valentinus viam delineavit, eam postmodo Ptolemaeus intravit, deduxit et Heracleon inde tramites quosdam.

Ptolemaeus' Letter to Flora. (Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. h. 33. p. 217. Migne, Vol. I. *p.* 557.) *I. Οἰκία γὰρ ἡ πόλις μερισθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν, ὅτι μὴ δύναται στῆναι, ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο. Ἔτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι, τά τε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδέν, ὁ ἀπόστολος προαποστερήσας τὴν τῶν ψευδηγορούντων ἀνυπόστατον σοφίαν, καὶ οὐ φθοροποιοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικαίου καὶ μισοπονήρου.* (Mark iii. 25 [Mat. xii. 25]; John i. 3.)

Ibid. Διαλεγόμενός που ὁ Σωτὴρ πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τοῦ ἀποστασίου συζητοῦντας αὐτῷ, ὁ δὴ ἀποστάσιον ἐξεῖναι ἐνενομοθέτητο, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. Θεὸς γάρ, φησι, συνέζευξε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν. Καί· ὃ συνέζευξεν ὁ Κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. (Mat. xix. 8, 6; Mark x. 5, 6.)

Ibid. p. 218. *Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰσί τινες συμπεπλεγμέναι παραδόσεις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, δηλοῖ καὶ τοῦτο ὁ Σωτήρ. Ὁ γὰρ Θεός, φησιν, εἶπε· Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου, καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται. Ὑμεῖς δέ, φησιν, εἰρήκατε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις λέγων, δῶρον τῷ Θεῷ ὃ ἐὰν ὠφεληθῇς ἐξ ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὑμῶν.* (Mat. xv. 5-8; Mark vii. 10-13.)

Ibid. p. 219. *Πάλιν δὲ δὴ τὸ ἓν μέρος, ὁ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμος, διαιρεῖται εἰς τρία τινὰ, εἴς τε τὴν καθαρὰν νομοθεσίαν, τὸν ἀσύμπλοκον τῷ κακῷ, ὃς καὶ κυρίως νόμος λέγεται, ὃν οὐκ ἦλθε καταλύσαι ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι, κ.τ.λ.* (Mat. v. 17.)

Ibid. p. 220. *Καὶ τὸ πάσχα δὲ ὁμοίως, καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα, ὅτι εἰκόνες ἦσαν, δηλοῖ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος· Τὸ δὲ Πάσχα ἡμῶν, λέγων, ἐτύθη Χριστός· καί ἵνα ἦτε, φησὶν, ἄζυμοι μὴ μετέχοντες ζύμης* (ζύμην δὲ νῦν τὴν κακίαν λέγει), *ἀλλ' ἦτε νέον φύραμα.* (1 Cor. v. 7.)

Ibid. Οὗτος γοῦν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι νόμος ὁμολογούμενος εἰς τρία διαιρεῖται, εἰς δὲ τὸ πληρούμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος. Τὸ γὰρ, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις,

ἐν τῷ μηδ' ὀργισθῆναι, μηδὲ ἐπιθυμήσεις περιείληπται. Διαιρεῖται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀναιρούμενον τελείως· τὸ γάρ· ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος, συμπεπλεγμένον τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, καὶ αὐτὸ ἔργον τῆς ἀδικίας ἔχον, ἀνῃρέθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων· τὰ δὲ ἐναντία ἀλλήλων εἰσὶν ἀναιρετικά. Ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ὅλως τῷ πονηρῷ, ἀλλὰ ἐάν τίς σε ῥαπίσῃ, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σιαγόνα. (Mat. v. 38, 39.)

Ibid. p. 221. Καὶ εἰ ὁ τέλειος Θεὸς ἀγαθός ἐστι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἔστιν· Ἕνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν Θεὸν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο. (Mat. xix. 17.)

Ibid. Τὸ δὲ τοῦ συμπεπλεγμένου νόμου τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, εἰπὼν τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι κατηργῆσθαι. Τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀσυμπλόκου τῷ χείρονι. Ὁ μὲν νόμος, εἰπὼν, ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. (Eph. ii. 15; Rom. vii. 12.)

10. Marcus.[1]

Iren. B. I. 16. 1. Τὴν οὖν γένεσιν τῶν Αἰώνων αὐτῶν, καὶ τὴν πλάνην τοῦ προβάτου καὶ ἀνεύρεσιν ἑνώσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, μυστικώτερον ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἀπαγγέλλειν οὗτοι οἱ εἰς ἀριθμοὺς τὰ πάντα κατάγοντες, ἐκ μονάδος καὶ δυάδος φάσκοντες τὰ ὅλα συνεστηκέναι. . . . τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δωδεκάδος ἀπόστασιν μίαν δύναμιν ἀπολωλέναι μαντεύονται· καὶ ταύτην εἶναι τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἀπολέσασαν τὴν δραχμὴν, καὶ ἅψασαν λύχνον, καὶ εὑροῦσαν αὐτήν. (Luke xv.)

Ibid. 18. 3. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν δεκάδα σημαίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν δέκα

[1] Marcus. Concerning the views of Marcus and the Marcosians, a section of the Valentinians, see Irenaeus, B. I. 13-21; Hippol. VI. 39-54; Pseudo-Tert. c. 5. p. 761 (Oehler); Philastrius Haer. 42; Epiph. Haer. 34, &c. Marcus professed (says Irenaeus) to improve upon his Master; and he had more intricate and more fanciful speculations. He dwelt much on the power of letters and of numbers. In his system was a Tetrad; and in the original text of Irenaeus (B. I. 14. 1) (or in the authority from which he quoted) the phrase קולארבע (Col-Arba, voice of the four) occurred. This was amplified into "Colarbasus;" Hippolytus so names some one, and Epiphanius ingeniously made an account of his heresy. This he did by extracting from Irenaeus (B. I. 12. 3) what is said of *quidam prudentiores*, who are mentioned after Ptolemaeus. See Lipsius, Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanius, p. 166. See also Dr Hort's account of the (not quite cleared up) puzzle in Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography, Art. "Colarbasus." It is scarcely necessary to show Marcus's references to the New Testament, or his perversions of John's Gospel.

ἐθνῶν, ὧν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ . . . καὶ οἱ δέκα ἀπόστολοι, οἷς φανεροῦται μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν ὁ Κύριος, τοῦ Θωμᾶ μὴ παρόντος, τὸν ἀόρατον διετύπουν κατ' αὐτοὺς δεκάδα. (John xx. 24.)

Ibid. 20. 2. Ἕνια δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ κειμένων εἰς τοῦτον τὸν χαρακτῆρα μεθαρμόζουσιν· ὡς τὴν πρὸς τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, δωδεκαετοῦς ὄντος, ἀπόκρισιν· οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου δεῖ με εἶναι; (Luke ii. 49.) ὃν οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, φασὶ, Πατέρα κατήγγελλεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκπέμψαι τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰς τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς, κηρύσσοντας τὸν ἄγνωστον αὐτοῖς Θεόν. Καὶ τῷ εἰπόντι αὐτῷ, διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τὸν ἀληθῶς ἀγαθὸν Θεὸν ὁμολογηκέναι εἰπόντα, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mat. xix. 16), κ.τ.λ.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VI. 42. *p.* 306. Καὶ εἶναι τούτους μορφὰς, ἃς ὁ Κύριος ἀγγέλους εἴρηκε, τὰς διηνεκῶς βλεπούσας τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρός. (Mat. xviii. 10.)

Prepon (Marcionite).

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 31. (*p.* 396.) Ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ τί με καλεῖς ἀγαθόν; (Luke xviii. 19; Mark x. 18.)

11. Docetae.[1]

ST MATTHEW, &c.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VIII. 9. (*p.* 416.) Καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι δοκοῦσιν οὗτοι τὸ λελεγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος· Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεί-

[1] Docetae. Though what is called Docetism was an ordinary tenet of Gnosticism, there seems to have been in the second century a special sect bearing the name of Docetae. They believed that our Lord inhabited a human body; but that under it he had another and more spiritual frame which he retained when he left the earthly form nailed to the cross. Uncertainty as to the date of this sect makes it useless to dwell upon their quotations. Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 13 says they were founded by Julius Cassianus, a pupil of Valentinus. Serapion (Eus. H. E. VI. 12) says that they used a book called the Gospel of Peter. This was in A.D. 190. References to Colossians ii. 11, 14, 15, and to 2 Cor. v. 3 may be found in Hippol. Ref. Haer. VIII. 10. Reference may be here made to other information supplied by Hippolytus.

Monoïmus, an Arabian (of uncertain date), who seems (Hippol. VIII. 12) to refer to John i. in his quotation of τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς· Ἦν καὶ ἐγένετο, and who quotes Col. i. 19; ii. 9 (Hippol. VIII. 13). He is mentioned by Theodoret, Fab. I. 18. Saturnilus (in Irenaeus, B. I. 24. 1 called Saturninus) was

ρων τοῦ σπεῖραι, καὶ [τὸ] πεσὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐποίει ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκέ, φησιν· Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω, ὅτι ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι πάντων ἀκούσματα. (Mat. xiii. 3, 8, 9; Mark iv. 3, 8, 9; Luke viii. 5, 8.)

Ibid. VIII. 10. (*p.* 420.) *Καὶ εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.* (Mat. xi. 14, 15.)

Ibid. (*p.* 422.) *Τοῦτό ἐστι, φησὶν, ὃ λέγει ὁ Σωτήρ· Ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅτι τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν.* (John iii. 5, 6.)

12. Theodotus.[1]

THEODOTUS QUOTED BY CLEM. ALEX.

Theodoti Epitomae (Dindorf's Ed. of Clem. Alex. Vol. III. p. 424, &c.), *c.* 6. (*John's Gospel used by the Valentinians.*) *Τὸ*

of Antioch in Syria, and taught the usual doctrine regarding the evil of matter, the sin of marriage, and the mission of Christ to deliver men from the God of the Jews. Hippolytus repeats Irenaeus's account of him almost *verbatim*.

[1] Theodotus. In explanation of our extracts from "Theodotus" it is necessary to prefix some notes. There were several of this name. The chief of them seems to have been a native of Byzantium, a tanner, who was excommunicated by Victor of Rome. Another, a banker, is said by Eusebius, H. E. V. 28, to have been a follower of his namesake. Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 35, 36, mentions both. Epiphanius, Haer. 54 (B. I. t. 2), speaks of Theodotus the tanner as the founder of a sect—the Theodotians. He speaks of this sect as a successor of the sect of the Alogi who denied John's Gospel. The story is that Theodotus—in some undefined persecution—denied Christ, and afterwards (in Rome to which he had fled) alleged that he had not denied God but Christ, a man. His arguments accordingly went to prove the mere humanity of Jesus Christ, and to cover the denial of his supernatural birth. But it is quite clear that this description, though it may be reconciled with Eusebius, does not apply to the person named by Hippolytus, who taught that Jesus was born of a virgin, and that Christ came from heaven, like a dove, upon him at his baptism. The views recorded in Hippolytus resemble those of Cerinthus. To which of those men do the extracts appended to the works of Clem. Alex. belong? Their title is Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί. For χρόνους it has been suggested to read αἰῶνας. The extracts seem to have been made by Clement for his own use, and entered in a commonplace book. When they are studied they seem to be the work of a Valentinian; and, therefore, apparently of a Theodotus different from those named before. The date of his writing is uncertain; but as being between the times of Valentinus and Clement, it may be put down for the beginning of the last quarter of the second century. We have given extracts showing the very numerous quotations of Scripture to be found in the pas-

"ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος," οἱ ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου οὕτως ἐκδέχονται. Ἀρχὴν μὲν γὰρ τὸν μονογενῆ λέγουσιν, κ.τ.λ.

THE GOSPELS QUOTED.

Ibid. c. 9. Ἡ πίστις οὐ μία, ἀλλὰ διάφορος. Ὁ γοῦν Σωτὴρ φησι· "Γενηθήτω σοι κατὰ τὴν πίστιν·" (Mat. ix. 29) ὅθεν εἴρηται τοὺς μὲν τῆς κλήσεως ἀνθρώπους κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου πλανηθήσεσθαι· ἀδύνατον δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς· διό φησι "καὶ εἰ δυνατὸν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς μου." (Mat. xxiv. 24.) Πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ, "ἐξέλθετε ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Πατρός μου" (John ii. 16), τοῖς κλητοῖς λέγει· πάλιν τῷ ἐξ ἀποδημίας ἐλθόντι καὶ κατεδηδοκότι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, ᾧ τὸν σιτευτὸν ἔθυσεν μόσχον (Luke xv. 23), τὴν κλῆσιν λέγει, καὶ ὅπου ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς κέκληκεν (Mat. xxii. 9). Πάντες μὲν οὖν κέκληνται ἐπ' ἴσης· βρέχει γὰρ ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπιλάμπει πᾶσιν· (Mat. v. 45) ἐκλέγονται δὲ οἱ μᾶλλον πιστεύσαντες, πρὸς οὓς λέγει "τὸν Πατέρα μοῦ οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός·" (John i. 18) καὶ "ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου·" (Mat. v. 14) καὶ "Πάτερ ἅγιε, ἁγίασον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου." (John xvii. 11.)

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

Ibid. c. 10. Καὶ ὁ μὲν φῶς ἀπρόσιτον εἴρηται, ὡς μονογενὴς καὶ πρωτότοκος, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὓς οὐκ

sages preserved (apparently by Clement). And following them we have given some extracts from Epiphanius, showing the passages of Scripture on which (according to him) Theodotus the tanner relied. It seems hopeless to try to reconcile the statements of Hippolytus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, &c., regarding the form of Cerinthianism or Ebionism professed by this Theodotus. Lipsius (p. 236) throws Hippolytus ("Pseudo-Origen") overboard, and inserts a negative in the text of Pseudo-Tertullian, in order to make the accounts agree. But this is a strong measure. Cave (Hist. Lit. p. 54) tries to blend the authorities in his time, but only makes a mosaic which is independent of them all. The second Theodotus (the banker) is said to have founded the sect of Melchizedekians, declaring that Christ was inferior to Melchizedek (see Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 36; Pseudo-Tert. c. 38). That sect, of course, founded on Hebrews v. 6; vi. 20; vii. 17. For a suggestion of difficulties about Theodotus, without clearing them up, see Dindorf's Clem. Alex. IV. p. 462. The passages given in our text are only specimens; but they contain references to the Gospels, Pauline Epistles (Rom., Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 Tim.), and 1 Peter. The passages in Epiphanius refer to Mat., Luke, John, Acts, 1 Tim.

ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. (1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 9.)

Ibid. c. 14. Καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι σώματά εἰσιν· ὁρῶνται γοῦν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ σῶμα. Ὁ γοῦν ἀπόστολος "σπείρεται μὲν γὰρ σῶμα ψυχικὸν, ἐγείρεται δὲ σῶμα πνευματικόν." (1 Cor. xv. 44.)

Ibid. c. 19. Εἶτα ἐπιφέρει "πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως." Ἀοράτου μὲν γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰκόνα τὸν λόγον τοῦ ἐν ταυτότητι, πρωτότοκον δὲ πάσης κτίσεως γεννηθεὶς ἀπαθῶς, κτίστης καὶ γενεσιάρχης τῆς ὅλης ἐγένετο κτίσεώς τε καὶ οὐσίας. Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν· ὅθεν καὶ μορφὴν δούλου λαβεῖν εἴρηται οὐ μόνον τὴν σάρκα κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν, ἀλλὰ δὲ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου. (Col. i. 15; Phil. ii. 7.)

Ibid. c. 22. Καὶ ὅταν εἴπῃ ὁ ἀπόστολος "ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν;" ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γὰρ, φησὶν, οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐβαπτίσαντο, ὧν ἐσμὲν μέρη. (1 Cor. xv. 29.)

Ibid. c. 44. Διὰ τούτου τοῦ μυστηρίου ὁ Παῦλος κελεύει τὰς γυναῖκας φορεῖν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. (1 Cor. xi. 10.)

Ibid. c. 49. Εἶπεν ὁ ἀπόστολος ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου οὐχ ἑκὼν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλευθερωθήσεται, ὅταν συλλεγῇ τὰ σπέρματα τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Rom. viii. 20, 21.)

Ibid. c. 85. Δεῖ οὖν ὡπλίσθαι τοῖς κυριακοῖς ὅπλοις, ἔχοντας τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄτρωτον, ὅπλοις σβέσαι τὰ βέλη τοῦ διαβόλου δυναμένοις, ὥς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος. (Eph. vi. 16.)

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL AND PETER.

Ibid. c. 86. Καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα διὰ σφραγῖδος δείκνυσι τίνος ἐστὶν ἕκαστον, καὶ ἐκ τῆς σφραγῖδος ἐκδικεῖται. Οὕτως καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ πιστὴ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας λαβοῦσα σφράγισμα τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ περιφέρει. (Gal. vi. 17.) Οὗτοί εἰσιν τὰ παιδία τὰ ἤδη ἐν τῇ κοίτῃ συναναπαυόμενα (Luke xi. 7), καὶ αἱ παρθένοι αἱ φρόνιμοι, (Mat. xxv. 1) αἷς αἱ λοιπαὶ αἱ μέλλουσαι οὐ συνεισῆλθον τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα ἀγαθὰ, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακῦψαι. (1 Pet. i. 12.)

THE EPISTLE OF PETER.

Ibid. c. 12. Φῶς δὲ νοερὸν ἡ μεγίστη προκοπὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ νοε-

ροῦ πυρὸς ἀποκεκαθαρμένου τέλεον, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακῦψαι, ὁ Πέτρος φησίν· (1 Pet. i. 12) ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἔτι τούτου καθαρώτερος ἀπρόσιτον φῶς καὶ δύναμις Θεοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τιμίῳ καὶ ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἀσπίλῳ αἵματι ἐλυτρώθημεν· οἷ τὰ μὲν ἱμάτια ὡς φῶς ἔλαμψεν, τὸ πρόσωπον δὲ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, ᾧ μηδὲ ἀντωπῆσαι ἐστὶ ῥᾴδιως. (1 Pet. i. 19; Mat. xvii. 2.)

THEODOTUS QUOTED BY EPIPHANIUS.

Epiph. Haeres. II. t. 1. *h.* 54. *p.* 463. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 964.) Ὅτι, φησιν, ὁ Χριστὸς ἔφη· Νῦν δέ με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι, ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα· ὁρᾷς, φησὶν, ὅτι ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν. (John viii. 40.)

Ibid. p. 464. Εἶτά φησι μηδὲ ἁμαρτίαν πεποιηκέναι ἀρνησάμενον τὸν Χριστὸν, αὐτοῦ, φησὶ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰπόντος πᾶσα βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ὁ λέγων λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. (Mat. xii. 31.)

Ibid. p. 465. Εἶτα, φησὶ, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἔφη τῇ Μαρίᾳ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπελεύσεται ἐπί σε· Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε πνεῦμα Κυρίου γενήσεται ἐν σοί· διὸ ἐκ πανταχόθεν φιλονεικῶν ὁ ἀνόητος ἄνθρωπος ἐκπίπτει τῆς ἀληθείας. (Luke i. 35.)

Ibid. p. 467. Ἀλλά, φησιν, εἶπον οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς σημείοις καὶ τέρασι. (Acts ii. 22) καὶ οὐκ εἶπον Θεὸν ἀποδεδειγμένον. Ἐλέγχῃ δὲ πάλιν, Θεόδοτε, ὅτι πάλιν οἱ αὐτοῦ ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς Πράξεσιν ἔφησαν, ὡς ὁ μακάριος Στέφανός φησιν· ἰδοὺ, ὁρῶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Acts vii. 56.)

Ibid. Πάλιν δὲ προφασίζεται λέγων ὅτι ἔφη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀπόστολος ὅτι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωπος, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, καὶ οὐκ οἶδε πῶς πάλιν καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐπεγείρει. (1 Tim. ii. 5.)

13. Apelles.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. X. 20. (*p.* 524.) Ἀπελλῆς δὲ ὁ τούτου μαθητὴς ἀπαρεσθεὶς τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου εἰρημένοις, καθὰ

[1] Apelles was a follower of Marcion, but not a close imitator. Tertullian

προείπομεν, ἄλλῳ λόγῳ ὑπέθετο τέσσαρας εἶναι Θεοὺς, ὧν ἕνα φάσκει [ἀγαθόν], ὃν οὔτε οἱ προφῆται ἔγνωσαν, οὔ εἶναι υἱὸν τὸν Χριστόν.

Jerome, Prooem. in Mat. See before, p. 99. (*Apelles the author of a Gospel.*)

Origen, ep. ad charos suos in Alexandr. (Rufini de Adult. Orig. Migne, Vol. VII. p. 626.) Videte, quali purgatione disputationem nostram purgavit, tali nempe, quali purgatione Marcion Evangelia purgavit vel apostolum; vel quasi successor ejus post ipsum Apelles. Nam sicut illi subverterunt Scripturarum veritatem, sic et iste, sublatis quae vere dicta sunt, ob nostri criminationem inseruit quae falsa sunt.

Epiph. Haeres. I. t. 3. h. 44. p. 381. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 824.) *Χριστὸν δὲ ἥκειν φῆς ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν, υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ ἄνω ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ Πνεῦμα ὡσαύτως ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν εἰς γνῶσιν αὐτοῦ ἐρχομένων· καὶ ἐλθόντα οὐ δοκήσει πεφηνέναι, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ σάρκα εἰληφέναι, οὐκ ἀπὸ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου, ἀλλὰ ἀληθινὴν μὲν ἐσχηκέναι τὴν σάρκα καὶ σῶμα, οὔτε ἀπὸ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς, οὔτε ἀπὸ γυναικὸς παρθένου, ἀλλ᾽ ἔσχε μὲν σάρκα ἀληθινὴν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ. Καί φησιν· Ἐν τῷ ἔρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ συνήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων σῶμα. . . . ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ξηροῦ τὸ ξηρὸν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ τὸ θερμὸν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑγροῦ*

(de Praescr. Haer. c. 30) says that for incontinence he incurred Marcion's displeasure, and left Rome for Alexandria. The story is doubtful. In his old age he was a man of high character at Rome (τὴν πολιτείαν σεμνυνόμενος καὶ τὸ γῆρας) when Rhodon opposed him (Eus. H. E. V. 13). This being in the reign of Commodus (A.D. 192), Apelles must have been in his manhood when Marcion was in Rome. Jerome's statement that he was the author of a Gospel may be explained by his reverence for the "Revelations of Philumene" (Φανερώσεις Φιλουμένης), a prophetess and prestidigitator who accompanied him. It is said (Tert. l. c.) that Apelles himself wrote them down as he learned them from her. He denied Christ's birth of a virgin. He taught that good works are indispensable to saving faith in Christ crucified (Eus. l. c.). See some of Tertullian's references to Apelles at pp. 46, 48. His relation to the canonical Scriptures is obscure. He probably accepted our Gospels, but denied their exclusive authority; and believed in the continued inspiration of men and women by the Holy Spirit. But he was only a heretic in a mild sense; his heresy being that he believed the Maker of the world to have made it to the glory of the supreme God who is Lord and self-existent, and that the supreme God sent Christ in the fulness of time to amend the world. Hippolytus (l. c.) affirms that he held by a succession of four Gods. But Epiphanius, Haer. 44 (quoted in our text), confirms Origen. See a very full account of Apelles in Lardner, IV. p. 639.

τὸ ὑγρὸν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ τὸ ψυχρόν. Καὶ οὕτως πλάσας ἑαυτῷ σῶμα, ἀληθινῶς πέφηνεν ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς τὴν ἄνω γνῶσιν, καταφρονεῖν τε τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ, καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα· ὑποδείξας ἡμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ Γραφῇ ποιά ἐστι τὰ φύσει ἐξ' αὐτοῦ εἰρημένα, καὶ ποῖά ἐστι τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ. Οὕτως γάρ, φησιν, ἔφη ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ· Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται.[2] Χρῶμαι γάρ, φησιν, ἀπὸ πάσης Γραφῆς ἀναλέγων τὰ χρήσιμα. Εἶτά φησιν· Ἔδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν παθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἐσταυρώθη ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀνέστησεν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτὴν τὴν σάρκα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς. Καὶ ἀναλύσας, φησὶν, αὐτὴν τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀπεμέρισε πάλιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν στοιχείων τὸ ἴδιον ἀποδοὺς, τὸ θερμὸν τῷ θερμῷ, τὸ ψυχρὸν τῷ ψυχρῷ, τὸ ξηρὸν τῷ ξηρῷ, τὸ ὑγρὸν τῷ ὑγρῷ· καὶ οὕτως διαλύσας ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν τὸ ἔνσαρκον σῶμα, ἀνέπτη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὅθεν καὶ ἦκε.

Ibid. p. 385. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἃ βούλει λαμβάνεις ἀπὸ τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς, καὶ ἃ βούλει καταλιμπάνεις· ἄρα γοῦν κριτὴς προεκαθίσας, οὐχ ἑρμηνευτὴς τῶν νόμων, ἀλλὰ ἐκλογεὺς τῶν οὐ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν σου γραφέντων, ἀλλὰ ὄντων μὲν ἀληθινῶν, παρά σοι δὲ μεταποιηθέντων ψευδῶς, καὶ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν τῆς σῆς ἀπάτης, καὶ τῶν ὑπό σου ἠπατημένων.

14. Julius Cassianus.

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 13. *p.* 553. Ἤγειται δὲ ὁ γενναῖος οὗτος Πλατωνικώτερον Θείαν οὖσαν τὴν ψυχὴν ἄνωθεν ἐπιθυμίᾳ θηλυνθεῖσαν δεῦρο ἥκειν εἰς γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν. Αὐτίκα βιάζεται τὸν Παῦλον ἐκ τῆς ἀπάτης τὴν γένεσιν συνεστάναι λέγειν διὰ τούτων "φοβοῦμαι δὲ μὴ ὡς ὁ ὄφις Εὔαν ἐξηπάτησεν φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν." (2 Cor. xi. 3.)

15. The Ebionites.[1]

Iren. B. I. 26. 2. Qui autem dicuntur Ebionaei consentiunt quidem mundum a Deo factum; ea autem, quae sunt erga Do-

[2] See before, p. 82, Note 1.

[1] The Ebionites were Jewish Christians holding by the Law. Epiphanius is

minum, non similiter ut Cerinthus et Carpocrates opinantur. Solo autem eo, quod est secundum Matthaeum, Evangelio utuntur et apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes.

Ibid. B. III. 11. 7. See before, p. 67.

Ibid. B. III. 15. 1. Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscunt, quoniam aut reliquis verbis Evangelii, quae per solum Lucam in nostram venerunt agnitionem, renuntiare debent, et non uti eis; aut si illa recipiunt omnia, habent necessitatem recipere etiam eam testificationem, quae est de Paulo, dicente ipso, primum quidem Dominum ei de coelo locutum: *Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?* &c.

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VII. 34. (*p.* 406.) (Compare also VII. 8, 9 and X. 22.) *Ἐβιωναῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσι μὲν τὸν κόσμον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ γεγονέναι, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοίως τῷ Κηρίνθῳ καὶ Καρποκράτει μυθεύουσιν. Ἔθεσιν Ἰουδαϊκοῖς ζῶσι, κατὰ νόμον φάσκοντες δικαιοῦσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντες δεδικαιῶσθαι ποιήσαντα τὸν νόμον· διὸ καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὠνομάσθαι, καὶ Ἰησοῦν, ἐπεὶ μηδεὶς τῶν [ἑτέρων] ἐτέλεσε τὸν νόμον· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἕτερός τις πεποιήκει τὰ ἐν νόμῳ προστεταγμένα, ἦν ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ Χριστός. Δύνασθαι δὲ καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ὁμοίως ποιήσαντας Χριστοὺς γινέσθαι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸν ὁμοίως ἄνθρωπον εἶναι πᾶσι λέγουσιν.*

Eus. H. E. III. 27. (See to the same effect, V. 8.) *Οὗτοι δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἀποστόλου πάσας τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀρνητέας ἡγοῦντο εἶναι δεῖν, ἀποστάτην ἀποκαλοῦντες αὐτὸν τοῦ νόμου, εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἀγωγὴν ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις παρεφύλαττον, ταῖς δ' αὖ κυριακαῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῖν τὰ παραπλήσια εἰς μνήμην τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐπετέλουν. Ὅθεν παρὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ἐγχείρησιν τῆς τοιᾶσδε λελόγχασι προσηγορίας, τοῦ Ἐβιωναίων ὀνόμα-*

the earliest authority for distinguishing between Ebionites and Nazarenes as two distinct Jewish sects. In earlier usage all Christians were called Nazarenes by their Jewish neighbours; all Jewish Christians were called Ebionites in the Christian Church. In this sense Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and even Eusebius, speak of Ebionites, though varied Christological views were known to exist among them. (Eus. H. E. III. 27.) See Introduction: "Gospel of Hebrews." Compare Lightfoot's Galatians, p. 305, and Lipsius, Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanius, p. 122.

τος, τὴν τῆς διανοίας πτωχείαν αὐτῶν ὑποφαίνοντος· ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐπίκλην ὁ πτωχὸς παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὀνομάζεται.

Ibid. VI. 17. *Τῶν γε μὴν ἑρμηνευτῶν αὐτῶν δὴ τούτων ἱστέον, Ἐβιωναῖον τὸν Σύμμαχον γεγονέναι. Αἵρεσις δέ ἐστιν ἡ τῶν Ἐβιωναίων οὕτω καλουμένη, τῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐξ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας γεγονέναι φασκόντων, ψιλόν τε ἄνθρωπον ὑφειληφότων αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸν νόμον χρῆναι Ἰουδαϊκώτερον φυλάττειν ἀπισχυριζομένων, ὥς που καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρόσθεν ἱστορίας ἔγνωμεν. Καὶ ὑπομνήματα δὲ τοῦ Συμμάχου εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται, ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἀποτεινόμενος εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν δεδηλωμένην αἵρεσιν κρατύνειν· ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ὠριγένης, μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνειῶν τοῦ Συμμάχου, σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τινὸς εἰληφέναι, ἣν καί φησι παρ' αὐτοῦ Συμμάχου τὰς βίβλους διαδέξασθαι.*[2]

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 127. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 409.) See before, p. 139.

Ibid. Ἤδη δέ που καί τινες πάλιν ἔφθασαν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην μεταληφθὲν εἰς Ἑβραΐδα ἐμφέρεσθαι ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων γαζοφυλακίοις, φημὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐν Τιβεριάδι, καὶ ἐναποκεῖσθαι ἐν ἀποκρύφοις, ὥς τινες τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεπιστευκότων ὑφηγήσαντο ἡμῖν κατὰ λεπτότητα· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὴν βίβλον ὡσαύτως ἀπὸ Ἑλλάδος γλώσσης εἰς Ἑβραΐδα μεταβληθεῖσαν λόγος ἔχει ἐκεῖσε κεῖσθαι ἐν τοῖς γαζοφυλακίοις, ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τοὺς ἀναγνόντας Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ἡμῖν ὑφηγησαμένους εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκέναι.

Ibid. p. 140. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 432.) *Πράξεις δὲ ἄλλας καλοῦσιν ἀποστόλων εἶναι, ἐν αἷς πολλὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ἔμπλεα, ἔνθεν οὐ παρέργως κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἑαυτοὺς ὥπλισαν. Ἀναβαθμοὺς δέ τινας καὶ ὑφηγήσεις δῆθεν ἐν τοῖς ἀναβαθμοῖς Ἰακώβου ὑποτίθενται, ὡς ἐξηγουμένου κατά τε τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, κατά τε τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ,*

[2] Did Symmachus *oppose* Matthew's Gospel in order to confirm the Ebionite position; or did he *use* it for that purpose? What means ἀποτεινόμενος? Jerome says that Symmachus wrote a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel; how then could he oppose it? May it not be that, in so far as the genuine St Matthew came short of the Ebionite doctrines, this Partisan-Commentator opposed it, and thereby established to his own satisfaction the worth of the passages peculiar to the Ebionite form of the book?

καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ κενοφωνίας ἔμπλεα, ὡς καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐνταῦθα κατηγοροῦντες οὐκ αἰσχύνονται ἐπιπλάστοις τισὶ τῆς τῶν ψευδαποστόλων αὐτῶν κακουργίας καὶ πλάνης λόγοις πεποιημένοις· Ταρσέα μὲν αὐτὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀρνεῖται, λέγοντες. Ἐξ Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου διὰ τὸ φιλάληθες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθὲν, ὅτι "Ταρσεύς εἰμι, οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης." (Acts xxiv. 39.) Εἶτα φάσκουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἕλληνα, καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μητρὸς καὶ Ἕλληνος πατρὸς παῖδα, ἀναβεβηκέναι δὲ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ χρόνον ἐκεῖ μεμενηκέναι, ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι δὲ θυγατέρα τοῦ ἱερέως πρὸς γάμον ἀγαγέσθαι, καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα προσήλυτον γενέσθαι καὶ περιτμηθῆναι, καὶ μηκέτι λαβόντα τὴν τοιαύτην κόρην ὠργίσθαι, καὶ κατὰ περιτομῆς γεγραφέναι καὶ κατὰ σαββάτου καὶ νομοθεσίας.

16. The Montanists or Cataphrygians.[1]

Hippol. Ref. Haer. VIII. 19. (Comp. X. 25, 26.) Ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ αἱρετικώτεροι τὴν φύσιν, Φρύγες τὸ γένος, προληφθέντες ὑπὸ γυναίων ἠπάτηνται, Πρισκίλλης τινὸς καὶ Μαξιμίλλης καλουμένων, ἃς προφήτιδας νομίζουσιν, ἐν ταύταις τὸ παράκλητον πνεῦμα κεχωρηκέναι λέγοντες, καί τινα πρὸ αὐτῶν Μοντανὸν ὁμοίως δοξάζουσιν ὡς προφήτην, ὧν βίβλους ἀπείρους ἔχοντες πλανῶνται, μήτε τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν λελαλημένα λόγῳ κρίναντες, μήτε τοῖς κρῖναι δυναμένοις προσέχοντες, ἀλλ' ἀκρίτως τῇ πρὸς αὐ-

[1] Montanus proclaimed at Pepuza in Phrygia (about A.D. 150, Gieseler) that the power of the Paraclete in the Church was to be perfected in his time. His seems to have been the longing for the perfection of the Church of Christ which from his day to Edward Irving's has influenced so many men of the highest earnestness. It was not to be expected that in Phrygia any form of religious enthusiasm would be kept within bounds. And accordingly Montanus and two prophetesses, Maximilla and Priscilla, claimed to have received special revelations. They adhered to the Christian creed, and to the Christian Canon (see Hippol. in our text), but in their zeal added new strictness to various practical observances. They "prescribed new and rigorous fasts, forbade second marriage, ascribed extraordinary value to celibacy and martyrdom, manifested profound contempt for everything earthly, and taught that incontinence, murder, and idolatry, though they did not exclude from the grace of God, shut a person for ever out of the Church." Gieseler, C. H., Vol. I. p. 148 (Eng. Trans.). They also proclaimed the speedy end of the world. They founded largely on the promises of the Paraclete in John's Gospel, and for their strict discipline appealed to Heb. vi. 4. In his later days Tertullian was a Montanist. In the Pseudo-Tert., Adv. Haer. c. 7, is an account of them: "Secundum Phrygas."

τοὺς πίστει προσφέρονται, πλεῖόν τι δι' αὐτῶν φάσκοντες [ὡς] μεμαθηκέναι ἢ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελίων. Ὑπὲρ δὲ ἀποστόλους καὶ πᾶν χάρισμα ταῦτα τὰ γύναια δοξάζουσιν, ὡς τολμιᾶν πλεῖόν τι Χριστοῦ ἐν τούτοις λέγειν τινὰς αὐτῶν γεγονέναι. Οὗτοι τὸν μὲν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων Θεὸν καὶ πάντων κτίστην ὁμοίως τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁμολογοῦσι καὶ ὅσα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρεῖ, καινίζουσι δὲ νηστείας καὶ ἑορτὰς καὶ ξηροφαγίας καὶ ῥαφανοφαγίας φάσκοντες ὑπὸ τῶν γυναίων δεδιδάχθαι.

Epiph.[2] *Haer. II. t.* 1. *h.* 48. *p.* 402. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 856.) Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας καλούμενοι δέχονται πᾶσαν γραφὴν παλαιὰν καὶ νέαν διαθήκην, καὶ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὁμοίως λέγουσι. Μοντανὸν δέ τινα προφήτην αὐχοῦσιν ἔχειν καὶ Πρισκίλλαν καὶ Μαξίμιλλαν προφήτιδας· οἷς προσέχοντες τὸν νοῦν ἐξέτρεψαν· περὶ δὲ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁμοίως φρονοῦσι τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.

Tertull. de jejun. c. 1. Hi paracleto controversiam faciunt; propter hoc novae prophetiae recusantur; non quod alium Deum praedicent Montanus et Priscilla et Maximilla, nec quod Jesum Christum solvant, nec quod aliquam fidei aut spei regulam evertant, sed quod plane doceant saepius jejunare quam nubere.

Iren. B. III. 11. 9. See before, p. 69.[3]

Jerome, Adv. Jovinian. B. II. 3. (Vallars. Vol. II. p. 324.) Et existimat aliquis securos, et dormientes nos esse debere post baptismum? Necnon ad Hebraeos: *Impossibile est enim eos qui semel sunt illuminati et gustaverunt donum coeleste, et participes facti sunt Spiritus Sancti, gustaveruntque nihilominus bonum Dei verbum, virtutesque saeculi futuri, et prolapsi sunt, renovari iterum ad poenitentiam, rursum crucifigentes sibimetipsis Filium Dei, et ostentui habentes.* (Heb. vi. 4, &c.) Certe eos qui illuminati sunt, et gustaverunt donum coeleste, et participes facti sunt Spiritus Sancti, gustaveruntque bonum Dei verbum, negare non possumus baptizatos. Si autem baptizati peccare non possunt, quomodo nunc Apostolus dicit, *et prolapsi sunt?* Verum

[2] Epiphanius entitles his chapter Κατὰ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας, ἤτοι Μοντανιστῶν καλουμένων, ἢ καὶ Τασκοδρουγιτῶν.

[3] Irenaeus points probably to the Alogi as repudiating John's Gospel because they did not admit the effusion of the Holy Spirit. See before, notes on pp. 69, 70. But some refer the passage to the Montanists.

ne Montanus, et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt non posse renovari per poenitentiam eos qui crucifixerunt sibimet Filium Dei, et ostentui habuerunt, consequenter hunc errorem solvit, et ait: *Confidimus autem de vobis dilectissimi meliora et viciniora saluti, tametsi ita loquimur. Non enim injustus est Deus, ut obliviscatur operis vestri et dilectionis, quam ostendistis in nomine ipsius, qui ministratis Sanctis, et nunc ministratis.* (Heb. vi. 9, 10.)

17. The Alogi.[1]

Iren. B. III. 11. 9. (See before, p. 69 and Notes.)

Eus. H. E. VII. 25. Dionysius says that "some" before his day rejected the Apocalypse altogether. (See before, p. 346.)

Epiph. Haer. II. t. 1. *h.* 51. *p.* 423. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 892.) *Φάσκουσι τοίνυν οἱ Ἄλογοι· ταύτην γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐπιτίθημι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν, ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς δεῦρο οὕτως κληθήσονται· καὶ οὕτως, ἀγαπητοὶ, ἐπιθῶμεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα, τουτέστιν Ἀλόγων. Εἶχον μὲν γὰρ τὴν αἵρεσιν καλουμένην, ἀποβάλλουσαν Ἰωάννου τὰς βίβλους. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν λόγον οὐ δέχονται τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένον, Ἄλογοι κληθήσονται.* (See continuation, p. 354, *Ἀλλότριοι κ.τ.λ.*)

Ibid. p. 424. *Προφασίζονται γὰρ οὗτοι αἰσχυνόμενοι ἀντιλέγειν τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἰωάννῃ, διὰ τὸ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὄντα, καὶ ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃς ἀξίως τὰ μυστήρια ἀπεκάλυπτεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀνέπεσε. Καὶ ἑτέρως αὐτὰ ἀνατρέπειν πειρῶνται. Λέγουσι γὰρ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὰ Ἰωάννου, ἀλλὰ Κηρίνθου. Καὶ οὐκ ἄξια αὐτὰ εἶναί φασιν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.*

[1] Alogi. There is no mention of the Alogi by name in any author save Epiphanius. His contemporary Philastrius is the only author who gives a description that can be applied to the same sect. This has led to grave doubts of there being any such sect. Lardner gives an absolute denial of their existence. Volkmar, in a work I have not seen, "Hippolyt und seine Zeitgenossen," seems to take up the same position. See Lipsius, Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanios, p. 23. There are some considerations, however, on the other side. Philastrius does not name the sect, though he describes it, and this may indicate that he and Epiphanius drew their information from the same source, so that Epiphanius is original only in giving the name. The vague expressions of Irenaeus and of Dionysius in Eusebius may be made to apply to the Alogi. On the whole, and without going into details, it seems probable that there were some objectors to the Johannine writings, as a recoil from the extravagances of Montanism (*e.g.* Caius, see p. 343 and note), and that Epiphanius *more suo* consolidated those scattered utterances into the manifesto of a sect. Some of those mentioned by Epiphanius seem to have lived in or near Thyatira.

Ibid. Καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπιβολῆς εὐθὺς ἐλέγχονται, μήτε ἃ λέγουσι νοοῦντες μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται. (1 Tim. i. 7.) Πῶς γὰρ ἔσται Κηρίνθου τὰ κατὰ Κηρίνθου λέγοντα; Κήρινθος γὰρ πρόσφατον καὶ ψιλὸν τὸν Χριστὸν λέγει ἄνθρωπον, ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀεὶ ὄντα τὸν λόγον κεκήρυχε καὶ ἄνωθεν ἥκοντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα.

Ibid. p. 441. (*The Alogi objected that the Gospel so soon speaks of the marriage in Cana, omitting what other Gospels record.*) Τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εἰς ὄνομα Ἰωάννου, φασὶ, ψεύδεται. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰπεῖν· ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὀλίγα τινὰ, εὐθὺς λέγει ὅτι γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Καὶ οὐ μέμνηνται οἱ ἀφροσύνην ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισπώμενοι ὡς Ἰωάννης μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν λόγον σάρκα γεγενῆσθαι καὶ ἐσκηνωκέναι ἐν ἡμῖν, τουτέστιν ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι, κ.τ.λ.

Ibid. p. 444. (*The Alogi objected that John speaks of two Passovers, the others of one.*) Κατηγοροῦσι δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ πάλιν τοῦ ἁγίου εὐαγγελιστοῦ, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτι, φασὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔφη δύο Πάσχα τὸν Σωτῆρα πεποιηκέναι ἐν περιόδῳ ἐνιαυτῶν δύο, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι εὐαγγελισταὶ περὶ ἑνὸς Πάσχα διηγοῦνται, καὶ οὐκ ἴσασιν οἱ ἰδιῶται ὅτι οὐ μόνον δύο Πάσχα ὁμολογεῖ τὰ εὐαγγέλια, ὡς πανταχόθεν ἐδείξαμεν, ἀλλὰ δύο μὲν πρῶτα λέγει, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἄλλο Πάσχα, ὡς εἶναι τρία Πάσχα ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κηρύγματος ἐπὶ τρισὶν ἔτεσιν ἕως τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Ibid. p. 454. (See before, p. 354, from φάσκουσι.)

Ibid. p. 455. (*The Alogi objected to Apoc. ii.* 18 *that there was no Church in Thyatira.*) Εἶτά τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐπιλαμβάνονται τούτου τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει, καὶ φάσκουσιν ἀντιλέγοντες ὅτι εἶπε πάλιν γράψον τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῷ ἐν Θυατείροις, καὶ οὐκ ἔνι ἐκεῖ ἐκκλησία Χριστιανῶν ἐν Θυατείροις. Πῶς οὖν ἔγραφε τῇ μὴ οὔσῃ; Καὶ εὑρίσκονται οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀναγκάζοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν ὧν κηρύττουσι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ὁμολογεῖν. Ἐὰν γὰρ εἴπωσιν, οὐκ ἔνι νῦν ἐκκλησία εἰς Θυατείρα, δεικνύουσι προπεφητευκέναι τὸν Ἰωάννην. Ἐνοικησάντων γὰρ τούτων ἐκεῖσε καὶ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας καὶ δίκην λύκων ἁρπαξάντων τὰς διανοίας τῶν ἀκεραίων πιστῶν, μετήνεγκαν τὴν πᾶσαν πόλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν αἵρεσιν, οἵ τε ἀρνούμενοι τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν κατὰ τοῦ λόγου τούτου εἰς ἀνατροπὴν κατ᾽

ἐκείνου καιροῦ ἐστρατεύοντο. Νῦν δὲ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ, μετὰ χρόνον ριβ' ἐτῶν, ἔστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία καὶ αὔξει, καὶ ἄλλαι τινὲς ἐκεῖσε τυγχάνουσι. Τότε δὲ ἡ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία ἐκενώθη εἰς τὴν κατὰ Φρύγας. Διὸ καὶ ἐσπούδασε τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἀποκαλύψαι ἡμῖν πῶς ἤμελλε πλανᾶσθαι ἡ ἐκκλησία μετὰ τὸν χρόνον τῶν Ἀποστόλων, τοῦ τε Ἰωάννου, καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς· ὃς ἦν χρόνος μετὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀνάληψιν, ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἔτεσιν, ὡς μελλούσης τῆς ἐκεῖσε ἐκκλησίας πλανᾶσθαι, καὶ χωνεύεσθαι ἐν τῇ κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσει.

Ibid. p. 456. Καί φασιν ὅτι εἶδον, καὶ εἶπε τῷ ἀγγέλῳ, λύσον τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐφράτου. Καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ στρατοῦ, μύριαι μυριάδες, καὶ χίλιαι χιλιάδες, καὶ ἦσαν ἐνδεδυμένοι θώρακας πυρίνους καὶ θειώδεις, καὶ ὑακινθίνους. (Apoc. ix. 14, &c.) Ἐνόμισαν γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦτοι μή πη ἄρα γέλοιόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια.

Philastr. de Haeres. (Ed. 1611) p. 27. Post hos (Chilionetitas) sunt Haeretici, qui Evangelium secundum Joannem et Apocalypsin ipsius non accipiunt et cum non intelligunt virtutem scripturae, nec desiderant discere, in Haeresi permanent percuntes, ut etiam Cerinthi illius Haeretici esse audeant dicere. Et Apocalypsin itidem, non beati Joannis Evangelistae et Apostoli, sed Cerinthi Haeretici, qui tunc ab Apostolis beatis Haereticus manifestatus, abjectus est ab ecclesia.

18. Clementine Homilies.[1]

Hom. II. 17. (*Antichrist predicted.*) Οὕτως δὴ, ὡς ὁ ἀληθὴς ἡμῖν προφήτης εἴρηκεν, πρῶτον ψευδὲς δεῖ ἐλθεῖν εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ πλάνου τινὸς, καὶ εἶθ' οὕτως μετὰ καθαίρεσιν τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου εὐαγγέλιον ἀληθὲς κρύφα διαπεμφθῆναι εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων αἱρέσεων· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς τῷ τέλει πάλιν πρῶτον Ἀντίχριστον ἐλθεῖν δεῖ, καὶ τότε τὸν ὄντως Χριστὸν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν ἀναφανῆναι, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον αἰωνίου φωτὸς ἀνατείλαντος πάντα τὰ τοῦ σκότους ἀφανῆ γενέσθαι. (1 John ii. 18.)

[1] For the principal passages bearing on John's Gospel, see before, pp. 184, 185, and "Introduction."

Ibid. c. 19. (*The Syrophoenician woman.*) Ἰούστα τις ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστι Συροφοινίκισσα, τὸ γένος Χανανῖτις, ἧς τὸ θυγάτριον ὑπὸ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνείχετο, ἥ καὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν προσῆλθε βοῶσα καὶ ἱκετεύουσα, ὅπως αὐτῆς τὸ θυγάτριον θεραπεύσῃ. Ὁ δὲ καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀξιωθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἰᾶσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, ἐοικότα κυσὶν, διὰ τὸ διαφόροις χρῆσθαι τροφαῖς καὶ πράξεσιν, ἀποδεδομένης τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τραπέζης τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ. Ἡ δὲ τοῦτο ἀκούσασα, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς τραπέζης, ὡς κύων, ψιχίων ἀποπιπτόντων συμμεταλαμβάνειν, μεταθεμένη ὅπερ ἦν, τῷ ὁμοίως διαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς τῆς βασιλείας υἱοῖς τῆς εἰς τὴν θυγατέρα, ὡς ἠξίωσεν, ἔτυχεν ἰάσεως. (Mark vii. 25-30. Comp. Mat. xv. 11-28.)

Ibid. c. 51. Εὐλόγως ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἔλεγεν· γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι. (Hom. III. 50; XVIII. 20.)

Hom. III. 15. (*Destruction of the Temple.*) Αὐτίκα γοῦν περὶ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος προλέγων ἔφη· Ὁρᾶτε τὰς οἰκοδομὰς ταύτας; ἀμὴν ὑμῖν λέγω, λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε, ὃς οὐ μὴ καθαιρεθῇ· καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, καὶ ἡ καθαίρεσις ἀρχὴν λήψεται. Ἐλεύσονται γὰρ καὶ καθιοῦσιν ἐνταῦθα, καὶ περιχαρακώσουσι, καὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἐνταῦθα κατασφάξουσιν. (Mat. xxiv. 2, 34; Luke xix. 43.)

Ibid. c. 18. (*Scribes and Pharisees.*) Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐζήτησας τίνος ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς βασιλείας χρόνος, τίνος ἡ τῆς προφητείας καθέδρα, καίτοι αὐτοῦ ἑαυτὸν μιμήσοντος τῷ λέγειν ἐπὶ τῆς καθέδρας Μωϋσέως ἐκάθισαν οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· πάντα ὅσα λέγωσιν ὑμῖν, ἀκούετε αὐτῶν. (Mat. xxiii. 2, 3, 14.) Αὐτῶν δὲ εἶπεν ὡς τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας πεπιστευμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶν γνῶσις, ἣ μόνη τὴν πύλην τῆς ζωῆς ἀνοῖξαι δύναται, δι' ἧς μόνης εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἐστιν. Ἀλλὰ ναὶ, φησὶν, κρατοῦσι μὲν τὴν κλεῖν, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν οὐ παρέχουσιν. (Luke xi. 52.)

Ibid. c. 40. (*Stewardship.* Compare also c. 64.) Ἐπεὶ οὖν δεῖ τινα ὁρίσαι ἀντ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἐμὸν ἀναπληροῦντα τόπον, μιᾷ προαιρέσει δεηθῶμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ οἱ πάντες, ὅπως τῶν ὄντων ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν κρείττονα αὐτὸς πρόδηλον ποιήσῃ ἵνα ἐπὶ τῆς Χριστοῦ καθέδρας καθεσθεὶς τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν εὐσεβῶς οἰκονομῇ. Τίς ἄρα ὁρισθήσεται; Θεοῦ γὰρ βουλῇ ἀναδείκνυται μακάριος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδόναι αὐτοῖς τὰς τροφὰς ἐν

καιρῷ αὐτῶν, μὴ ἐννοούμενον καὶ λέγοντα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἐλθεῖν· καὶ ἄρξηται τύπτειν τοὺς συνδούλους αὐτοῦ, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων μετά τε πόρνων καὶ μεθυόντων· καὶ ἥξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷ, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει, καὶ διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸ ἀπιστοῦν αὐτοῦ μέρος μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει. (Mat. xxiv. 45, &c.; Luke xii. 42, &c.)

Ibid. c. 49. (*Peter and Simon agree to regard Jesus as predicted in Scripture.*) Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἔφη· αὐτίκα ἐρῶ. Γέγραπται ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τοῦ νόμου βιβλίῳ πρὸς τοῖς τελευταίοις· "οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα, οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ οὗ ἔστιν· καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν." (Gen. xlix. 10.) Ἐάν τις οὖν τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἐξ Ἰούδα ἐκλεῖψαι ἄρχοντα καὶ ἡγούμενον, ἐληλυθότα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν προσδοκᾶσθαι μέλλοντα, νοῆσαι δυνηθῇ, οὗτος τὴν περικοπὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀποτελεσθέντων ἀληθῆ τὸν ἐληλυθότα ἐπιγνῶν· οὗ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ πειθόμενος γνώσεται τίνα ἐστὶν τῶν γραφῶν τὰ ἀληθῆ, τίνα δὲ τὰ ψευδῆ. Καὶ ὁ Σίμων· συνίημι ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὑμῶν λέγεις, ὡς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς προφητευθέντα. Δεδόσθω τοιγαροῦν οὕτως ἔχειν. Λέγε τοίνυν πῶς ὑμᾶς διακρίνειν τὰς γραφὰς ἐδίδαξεν;

Ibid. c. 50. (*Be careful in selecting Scripture.*) Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος· ὅτι μέμικται τὰ ἀληθῆ τοῖς ψεύδεσιν, μέμνημαί που αὐτὸν αἰτιώμενον τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους εἰπεῖν· "διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν, οὓς εἵνεκεν ἀγνοεῖτε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ." (Mark xii. 24.) Εἰ δὲ τὰ ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν ἀγνοεῖν αὐτοὺς ὑπέβαλεν, δῆλον ὡς ὄντων ψευδῶν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ φάναι· "Γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι," ὡς δοκίμων καὶ κιβδήλων λόγων ὄντων· καὶ τῷ εἰπεῖν· "διὰ τί οὐ νοεῖτε τὸ εὔλογον τῶν γραφῶν;" Βεβαιότερον τοῦ αὐθαιρέτως εὐγνωμονοῦντος τίθησιν τὸν νοῦν.

Ibid. c. 51. (*The Law.*) Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν· "Οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον" (Mat. v. 17), καὶ φαίνεσθαι αὐτὸν καταλύοντα, σημαίνοντος ἦν, ὅτι, ἃ κατέλυεν, οὐκ ἦν τοῦ νόμου. Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰπεῖν· Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. (Mat. xxiv. 35; v. 18.) Τὰ πρὸ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς παρερχόμενα ἐσήμανεν μὴ ὄντα τοῦ ὄντως νόμου.

Ibid. c. 52. (*Christ's account of Himself.*) Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐρανοῦ

καὶ γῆς ἔτι συνεστώτων παρῆλθον θυσίαι, βασιλείαι, αἱ "ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν" προφητεῖαι, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, ὡς οὐκ ὄντα Θεοῦ προστάγματα· ἔνθεν γοῦν λέγει, "Πᾶσα φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκριζωθήσεται." (Mat. xv. 13.) Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθὴς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν· "Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δι' ἐμοῦ εἰσερχόμενος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν ζωήν," (John x. 9), ὡς οὐκ οὔσης ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας· διὸ καὶ ἐβόα λέγων· "Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες" (Mat. xi. 28), τουτέστιν οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦντες, καὶ μὴ εὑρίσκοντες αὐτήν· καὶ πάλιν· "Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς," (John x. 27), καὶ ἄλλοτε· "ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὑρίσκετε" (Mat. vii. 7), ὡς μὴ προδήλως κειμένης τῆς ἀληθείας.

Ibid. c. 53. (*Prophecy and the Heavenly voice.*) Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ οὐρανῶν μάρτυς φωνὴ ἠκούσθη λέγουσα· "Οὗτος ἐστίν μου ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα, τούτου ἀκούετε," (Mat. iii. 17; Luke ix. 35), καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐπὶ πλεῖον αὐτοὺς πεπλανημένους ἐλέγξαι θέλων τοὺς προφήτας, παρ' ὧν δὴ μεμαθηκέναι ἐβεβαίουν, ἐπιθυμοῦντας ἀληθείας καὶ μὴ μεμαθηκότας τελευτήσαντας ἀπεφήνατο εἰπών· "Πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν, ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι, ἃ ὑμεῖς ἀκούετε, καὶ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὔτε εἶδον, οὔτε ἤκουσαν," (Mat. xiii. 17; Luke x. 24), ἔτι μὴν ἔλεγεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι, περὶ οὗ Μωϋσῆς προεφήτευσεν, εἰπών, προφήτην ἐγερεῖ ὑμῖν Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐμέ, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε κατὰ πάντα. Ὃς ἂν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου, ἀποθανεῖται. (John v. 46; Deut. xviii. 15; Acts iii. 22.)

Ibid. c. 54. (*The Sadducees.*) Πλὴν τἀληθῆ τοῦ νόμου εἰδὼς, Σαδδουκαίοις πυνθανομένοις, καθ' ὃν λόγον Μωϋσῆς ἑπτὰ συνεχώρησεν γαμεῖν, ἔφη, "Μωϋσῆς κατὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὕτως οὐκ ἐγένετο· ὁ γὰρ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν." (Mat. xxii. 23; xix. 8, 4; Mark x. 5, 6.)

Ibid. c. 55. (*Oaths and Prayer.*) Τοῖς δὲ νομίζουσιν, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ διδάσκουσιν, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὀμνύει, ἔφη· "Ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί, τὸ οὒ οὔ· τὸ γὰρ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ

πονηροῦ ἐστιν." (Mat. v. 37.) *Καὶ τοῖς λέγουσιν, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἀπέθανον, ἔφη· "Οὐκ ἔστιν Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων."* (Mat. xxii. 32.) *Τοῖς δὲ οἰομένοις, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς πειράζει, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, ἔφη· "Ὁ πονηρός ἐστιν ὁ πειράζων,*[2] *ὁ καὶ αὐτὸν πειράσας."* *Τοῖς δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς οὐ προγινώσκει ἔφη· "Οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀξιώσητε."* (Mat. iv. 3; vi. 8, 32.) *Τοῖς δὲ πιστεύουσιν, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, ὅτι μὴ πάντα βλέπει, "Ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ εὔχεσθε" εἰπών, "Καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ βλέπων τὰ κρυπτὰ ἀποδώσει ὑμῖν."* (Mat. vi. 6.)

Ibid. c. 56. (*The Heavenly Father.*) *Τοῖς δὲ οἰομένοις αὐτὸν μὴ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, ἔφη· "Τίνα ὑμῶν αἰτήσει υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς, πονηροὶ ὄντες, οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτουμένοις αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς ποιοῦσιν τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ;"* (Luke xi. 11; Mat. vii. 9.) *Τοῖς δὲ αὐτὸν διαβεβαιουμένοις ἐν ναῷ εἶναι, ἔφη· "Μὴ ὀμόσητε τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὅτι θρόνος Θεοῦ ἐστὶν, μήτε τὴν γῆν, ὅτι ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστίν."* (Mat. v. 35.) *Τοῖς δὲ προλαβοῦσιν ὅτι θυσιῶν ὀρέγεται ὁ Θεὸς ἔφη· "Ὁ Θεὸς ἔλεος θέλει καὶ οὐ θυσίας, ἐπίγνωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐχ ὁλοκαυτώματα."* (Mat. ix. 13; xii. 7.)

Ibid. c. 57. (*The Good God.*) *Τοῖς δὲ πειθομένοις κακὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, ἔφη· "Μή με λέγετε ἀγαθόν. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς εἷς ἐστίν."* (Mat. xix. 17.) *"Γίνεσθε ἀγαθοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὃς ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς καὶ πονηροῖς, καὶ φέρει τὸν ὑετὸν ἐπὶ δικαίοις καὶ ἀδίκοις."* (Luke vi. 35; Mat. v. 45.) *Τοῖς δὲ ἠπατημένοις πολλοὺς θεοὺς ὑπονοεῖν, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, ἔφη· "Ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν, Κύριος εἷς ἐστίν."* (Mark xii. 29.)

Ibid. c. 61. (*The unfaithful servant.*) *Εἰ δέ τις τῶν παρεστώτων, διοικεῖν δυνάμενος τὴν ἀγνωμοσύνην τῶν ἀνθρώπων,*

[2] Source unknown.

ὑποστέλλεται, τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀναπαύσεως φροντίζων μόνης καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκάτω ἀκοῦσαι· δοῦλε πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρέ, ἔδει σε τὸ ἀργύριόν μου προβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζιτῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἂν ἐλθὼν ἔπραξα τὸ ἐμόν· ἐκβάλετε τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. (Mat. xxv. 26; Luke xix. 22.)

Ibid. c. 63. (*Zacchaeus.*) Τίνα δὲ ἄλλον αἱρήσομαι τῶν παρόντων, ἢ Ζακχαῖον, πρὸς ὃν καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν εἰσιὼν ἀνεπαύσατο, τοῦ σώζεσθαι κρίνας ἄξιον εἶναι; (See Luke xix. 5, 8.)

Ibid. c. 71. Ἀξιός ἐστιν ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. (Luke x. 7.)

Ibid. VIII. 4. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοὶ, φησὶν, κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. (Mat. xx. 16.)

Ibid. c. 7. Τούτου γὰρ ἕνεκεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν πρός τινα πυκνότερον κύριον αὐτὸν λέγοντα, μηδὲν δὲ ποιοῦντα ὧν αὐτὸς προσέταξεν, ἔφη· Τί με λέγεις, κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἃ λέγω; (Luke vi. 46; Mat. vii. 21.)

Ibid. IX. 22. Ἀλλ' ὅμως κἂν πάντες δαίμονες μετὰ πάντων τῶν παθῶν ὑμᾶς φεύγωσιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ χαίρειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ δι' εὐαρεστίαν τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς ἀεὶ ζώντων ἀναγραφῆναι. (Compare Luke x. 20.)

Ibid. XI. 20. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ διδάσκαλος προσηλωθεὶς ηὔχετο τῷ πατρὶ, τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀναιροῦσιν ἀφεθῆναι τὸ ἁμάρτημα εἰπών· Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν ἃ ποιοῦσιν. (Luke xxiii. 34.)

Ibid. XII. 29. Ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας προφήτης ἔφη· Τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ· μακάριος δὲ, φησὶν, δι' οὗ ἔρχεται· ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. (Mat. xviii. 7; Luke xvii. 1.)

Ibid. XVI. 21. Ἔσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἱρέσεις φιλαρχίαι.

Ibid. XVII. 5. Μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποκτείνοντος τὸ σῶμα, τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ μὴ δυναμένου τι ποιῆσαι· φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς βαλεῖν. Ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε. Ὅτι δὲ ὄντως τοῦτον φοβηθῆναι ἔλεγεν ὡς δίκαιον Θεὸν, πρὸς ὃν καὶ ἀδικουμένους βοᾶν λέγει, παραβολὴν εἰς τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐπάγει τὴν ἑρμηνείαν λέγων· εἰ οὖν ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας ἐποίησεν οὕτως, διὰ τὸ ἑκάστοτε ἀξιωθῆναι, πόσῳ μᾶλλον

ὁ πατὴρ ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν βοώντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός; ἢ διὰ τὸ μακροθυμεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς δοκεῖτε ὅτι οὐ ποιήσει; Ναὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, ποιήσει, καὶ ἐν τάχει. (Luke xii. 4, 5; Mat. x. 28; Luke xviii. 6-8.)

Ibid. XVIII. 15. *Καὶ ὁ Σίμων ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀγανακτήσας ἔφη· τὸν σὸν διδάσκαλον αἰτιῶ εἰπόντα· ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἅπερ ἦν κρυπτὰ σοφοῖς, ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις θηλάζουσιν. . . . ἐνδέχεται γὰρ αὐτοῦ εἶναι τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἃ ἔλεγεν τῷ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν εἰπεῖν· Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου ἐν παραβολαῖς, καὶ ἐξερεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.* (Mat. xi. 25; xiii. 35.)

Ibid. XIX. 2. (*Temptation and Punishment.*) *Καὶ ἄλλη που οἶδα αὐτὸν εἰρήκοτα· εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη, πῶς οὖν στήκῃ ἡ βασιλεία; Καὶ ἄλλοθι ἔφη· Ὁ δὲ τὸ κακὸν σπέρμα σπείρας ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος, καὶ πάλιν· Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλὰ καὶ συμβουλεύων εἴρηκεν· Ἔστω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ᾗ παρέδωκε εὐχῇ ἔχομεν εἰρημένον. Ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Καὶ ἄλλη που εἰπεῖν ὑπέσχετο τοῖς ἀσεβοῦσιν. Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον ὃ ἑτοίμασε ὁ πατὴρ τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.* (Mat. v. 37; vi. 15; Eph. iv. 27; James v. 12.)

Ibid. c. 7. *Οὕτω γὰρ ὁ ἀψευδὴς ἡμῶν εἶπε διδάσκαλος· Ἐκ περισσεύματος καρδίας στόμα λαλεῖ.* (Mat. xii. 34.)

Ibid. c. 20. *Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος· μεμνήμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ὑμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου ὡς ἐντελλόμενος εἶπεν ὑμῖν· Τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε.*[3]

[3] Source unknown. — For the use made in the Clementine Homilies of other Books of Scripture the following references may suffice:

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Ibid. III. 53. See above, p. 203. (Acts iii. 22; vii. 37.)

GALATIANS.

Ibid. XIX. 22. See before, p. 236. (Gal. iv. 10.)

Ibid. XVII. 19. See before, p. 236, note to Clem. Hom.

EPHESIANS.

Ibid. XIX. 2. See before, p. 241. (Eph. iv. 27.)

19. Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.[1]

Levi 4. *Ποιήσει Κύριος κρίσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι τῶν πετρῶν σχιζομένων καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου σβεννυμένου καὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ξηραινομένων, καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς καταπτήσσοντος, καὶ πάσης κτίσεως κλονουμένης καὶ ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τηκομένων τοῦ ᾅδου σκυλευομένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὑψίστου, οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀπιστοῦντες ἐπιμενοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις.* (Mat. xxvii. 45.)

Levi 10. *Ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσεβείας ὑμῶν καὶ παραβάσεως ἣν ποιήσετε ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου, ἀσεβοῦντες, πλανῶντες τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπεγείροντες αὐτῷ κακὰ μεγάλα παρὰ Κυρίου.* (Heb. ix. 26.)

Levi 14. *. . . . τῶν ἀρχιερέων, οἵτινες ἐπιβαλοῦσι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου.* (Mat. xxvii. 1.)

Levi 18. *Καὶ μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τὴν ἐνδίκησιν αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίου, τῇ ἱερατείᾳ τότε ἐγερεῖ Κύριος ἱερέα καινὸν, ᾧ πάντες οἱ λόγοι Κυρίου ἀποκαλυφθήσονται . . . . Καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον αὐτοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς βασιλεὺς, φωτίζων φῶς γνώσεως ἐν ἡλίῳ ἡμέρας . . . . Οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἥξει ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἁγίασμα μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς ὡς ἀπὸ*

[1] Tertullian (Adv. Marc. V. 1. Scorp. c. 13) has references to a portion of this book, Test. Benj. c. 11. Origen also (Hom. in Joshuam XV. c. 6) refers to it by name with a certain measure of respect, although declaring that it is not in the Canon. It professes to be the legacy of good counsels left by each of the Sons of Jacob to his children. It is the work of a Jewish Christian favourable to St Paul, who dwells upon the Patriarchal rather than the Mosaic period of Jewish History. It has been supposed by some (following Grabe) that the work was written by a Jew before the Christian era, and afterwards interpolated so as to contain Pauline Christian theology. In favour of this view it may be urged that the writing is not always consistent with itself, but we must urge on the other hand that, even allowing due weight to this, it seems rather to show a Jewish author proud of his ancestry and yet devoted to his Christian faith than to require us to regard all the Christian passages as interpolations in a Jewish original. See Sinker's "Testamenta XII Patriarcharum" for copious discussions. Some (Anger) make the date soon after the middle of the second century; but there is much reason to put it earlier, even at the beginning of the century, inasmuch as the author seems to write before Judaism was so hopelessly overthrown as it was before the middle of the second century. The principal references to the N. T., in addition to those in our text, seem to be Jud. 20, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (John xv. 26); Levi 3, ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικήν (Rom. xii. 1); Dan 5, τὸν Θεὸν τῆς εἰρήνης (John xv. 33); Zab. 9, Θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου; Benj. 10, τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινώσεως (Phil. ii. 6-8); Benj. 3, ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης (Heb. xiii. 20); Is. 7, ἁμαρτίαν εἰς θάνατον (1 John v. 16); Levi 18, δώσει τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς (Rev. ii. 7); Dan 5, τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλήμ (Rev. xxi. 2).

Ἀβραὰμ πατρὸς Ἰσαάκ. Καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεως καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καταπαύσει ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι. (Mat. ii. 2.)

Judah 24. Καὶ ἀνοιγήσονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐκχέαι πνεύματος εὐλογίαν πατρὸς ἁγίου. (Ibid.)

Dan 6. Ὁ πατὴρ (al. σωτὴρ) τῶν ἐθνῶν· ἔστι γὰρ ἀληθὴς καὶ μακρόθυμος πρᾷος καὶ ταπεινὸς, καὶ ἐκδιδάσκων διὰ τῶν ἔργων νόμον Θεοῦ. (Mat. xi. 30.)

Asher 7. Ἕως οὗ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπισκέψηται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων. (Mat. xi. 19.)

Benjamin 6. Πληρωθήσεται ἐν σοὶ προφητεία οὐρανοῦ περὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ σωτῆρος τοῦ κόσμου, ὅτι παραδοθήσεται, καὶ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀποθανεῖται, ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης. (Mat. xxvi. 27; John i. 29.)

Benjamin 11. Καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου ἐν ὑστέροις καίροις ἀγαπητὸς Κυρίου, ἀκούων ἐπὶ γῆς φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, γνῶσιν καινὴν φωτίζων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη φῶς γνώσεως ἐπεμβαίνων τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν σωτηρίᾳ, καὶ ἁρπάζων ὡς λύκος ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διδοὺς τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐθνῶν. Καὶ ἕως συντελείας τῶν αἰώνων ἔσται ἐν συναγωγαῖς ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν, ὡς μουσικὸν μέλος ἐν στόματι πάντων. Καὶ ἐν βίβλοις ἁγίαις ἔσται ἀναγραφόμενος, καὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔσται ἐκλεκτὸς Θεοῦ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος· καὶ δι᾽ αὐτὸν συνέτισέ με Ἰακὼβ ὁ πατήρ μου, λέγων· Αὐτὸς ἀναπληρώσει τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς φυλῆς σου. (St Paul's Epp. passim.)

The following lists of Heretics from the chief authorities may be interesting. It is from Lipsius, "Zur Quellen-Kritik," with some alterations.

Irenaeus.	Hippolytus.[1]	Epiphanius.	Philastrius.	Pseudo-Tertullian.[2]	Theodoret.
Valentinus and his School.	Naassenes Peratae Sethians Justin (later in Summary).				
Simon	Simon Valentinus Secundus Ptolemaeus Marcus Heracleon	Simon	Simon	Simon	Simon
Menander	Basilides	Menander	Menander	Menander	Menander
Saturninus	Saturnilus	Saturninus	Saturninus	Saturninus	Saturninus
Basilides	Menander	Basilides	Basilides	Basilides	Basilides
		Nicolaitans	Nicolaitans	Nicolaitans Ophites	
	Marcion (Prepon)			Cainites Sethians	
Carpocrates	Carpocrates	Carpocras	Carpocras	Carpocrates	Carpocrates
Cerinthus	Cerinthus	Cerinthus (Nazarenes)	Cerinthus	Cerinthus	
Ebionites	Ebionites Theodotus (Byz.) The other Theodotus and Melchizedekians	Ebionites	Ebionites	Ebionites	

[1] Hippolytus does not observe quite the same order in his Summary. Cerdon, Apelles, Monoimus, Tatian are earlier in the summary: Carpocrates and Hermogenes are later.

[2] Epiphanius, Philastrius and Pseudo-Tertullian seem to draw from the same source. Hippolytus is in the main based on Irenaeus whose very words he often reproduces. See Lipsius's "Quellen d. ältesten Ketzergeschichte."

Irenaeus.	Hippolytus.	Epiphanius.	Philastrius.	Pseudo-Tertullian.	Theodoret.
Nicolaitans	Nicolaitans				
		Valentinians	Valentinians	Valentinians	Valentinians
		Secundus, Ptolemaeus	Ptolemaeus, Secundus	Ptolemaeus, Secundus	Secundus and others
		Marcosians	Heracleon	Heracleon	Marcus
		Colarbasus, Heracleon	Marcus, Colarbasus	Marcus, Colarbasus	Colarbasus
		Ophites			Sethians or Ophites
		Cainites			Cainites
		Sethians			Peratae, Monoimus
		Archontites			Bardesanes
Cerdon	Cerdon	Cerdon	Cerdon	Cerdon	Cerdon
Marcion	Marcion	Marcion	Marcion	Marcion	Marcion
	Lucian	Lucian	Lucan	Lucan	
	Apelles	Apelles	Apelles	Apelles	Apelles
	Docetae				Manes
	Monoimus				
Encratites	Tatian	Tatian	Tatian	Tatian	
Tatian	Hermogenes	Secundum Phrygas	Cataphrygians	Secundum Phrygas	
Simonians	Quartodecimans	Quartodecimans			
Barbeliotes, &c.	Cataphrygians	Alogi, &c.			
Cainites	Encratites				
	Noetos	Theodotus (Byz.)	Theodotus (Byz.)	Theodotus (Byz.)	Theodotus (Byz.)
	Elkesaites	Melchizedekians	Melchizedekians	The other Theodotus and Melchizedekians	Melchizedekians
		Noetians	Noetians		Elkesaites, &c.
					Nicolaitans
					Montanists
					Noetians
					Quartodecimans.

PART IV.

EXTRA-CANONICAL GOSPELS.

PART IV.

EXTRA-CANONICAL GOSPELS.[1]

1. GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS.

(See also Sections II. VI.)

A. TESTIMONIES TO THE EXISTENCE OF THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS.

1. Ignatius.

Ignatius ad Smyrn. c. 3. See before, p. 111, Note 3.

Jerome, de Vir. Ill. c. 16. Scripsit (sc. Ignatius) et ad Smyrnaeos (proprie ad Polycarpum) . . . in qua et de Evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium. (See whole passage below.)

2. Hegesippus.[1]

Eus. H. E. II. 23; *III.* 20. See before, p. 127. (*Hegesippus had some other authority than G. H.*)

Ibid. IV. 22. See before, p. 128 and Note 6. (*Hegesippus quoted from G. H. and from* (or, *which is in?*) *Syriac.*)

[1] This title seems more fitly to describe them than "Heretical Gospels" (which the Nazarene form of the Gospel of the Hebrews cannot be said to be) or "Apocryphal Gospels" (which the Gospel of the Hebrews in any form scarcely was). The "Gospel of James" or the "Gospel of Nicodemus" may be called Apocryphal.

[1] Hegesippus. On Hegesippus see Introduction, and before, p 128, note 7. See there also a quotation from Photius showing that a quotation by him agrees with our St Mat. xiii. 16. He is the first of whom we read that he used the G. H., but it does not appear that he used it in preference to the Canonical Gospels.

3. Papias.

Eus. H. E. III. 39. See before, p. 57 and Note 7. (*Papias' work and G. H. had a narrative about a sinful woman.*)[1]

4. Irenaeus.

B. I. 26. 2. See before, p. 431. (*The Ebionites used only Matthew's Gospel.*)[1]

B. III. 11. 7. See before, p. 67. (*Same effect as foregoing.*)

5. Clement of Alexandria.

Strom. II. 9. *p.* 453. *Ταύτης δὲ ἀρχὴ τὸ θαυμάσαι τὰ πράγματα, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ λέγει, καὶ Ματθίας ἐν ταῖς παραδόσεσι παραινῶν 'Θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα,' βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθέμενος· ᾗ κἂν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγελίῳ, 'Ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει,' γέγραπται, 'Καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται.'*

Ibid. V. 10. *p.* 684. *Οὐ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησὶ, παρήγγειλεν ὁ Κύριος ἔν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ, "Μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου."*[1]

6. Origen.

Comment. in Joann. t. 2. Tom. IV. p. 63. (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 132.) *Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγένετο . . . εἰ καὶ λέξεις τινὲς περισπᾶν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον δοκοῦσιν. Ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν· Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπένεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ· ἐπαπορήσει πῶς μήτηρ Χριστοῦ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Λό-*

[1] Papias. Eusebius does not say that Papias quoted the Gospel of the Hebrews; but he says that the narrative of the woman accused of many sins which Papias recorded was in that Gospel. As said in p. 57 (note 7), it is Eusebius, not Papias, who refers to that Gospel.

[1] Irenaeus. Irenaeus says in general terms that the Ebionites are convicted of wrong views of God, even from that Gospel according to Matthew which alone they use; and again, that they use only Matthew's Gospel, and reject Paul as an apostate from the Law.

[1] Clem. Alex. So in Clem. Hom. XIX. 20: Μεμνήμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου ὡς ἐντελλόμενος εἶπεν ἡμῖν· τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε. Clem. Alex. is referring to *Barnabas* in the beginning of the chapter.

γου γεγεννημένον Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον εἶναι δύναται. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο οὐ χαλεπὸν ἑρμηνεῦσαι. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φθάνει τὸ 'ἀδελφὸς Χριστοῦ' ὄνομα οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τούτου θειότερα· οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔσται μᾶλλον πάσης χρηματιζούσης μητρὸς Χριστοῦ διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Πατρὸς, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον εἶναι μητέρα.

Homil. in Jerem. 15. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 433.) *Εἰ δέ τις παραδέχεται τὸ ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα τὸ Ταβὼρ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.*[1]

7. Eusebius.

Eus. H. E. III. 25. See before, p. 11. (*Hebrew Christians use the G. H.*)

Ibid. III. 27. See before, p. 432. (*Ebionites use G. H. alone.*)

Eus. Theoph. IV. 12. The cause therefore of the divisions of soul that came to pass in houses Himself taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said, &c.[1]

Ibid. Τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἦκον Ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν Εὐαγγέλιον.[2] (Migne, Vol. IV. p. 155.)

8. Jerome.

Comment. ad Eph. V. 4. (Vallars. Vol.. VII. p. 641.) In Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: "Et nunquam," inquit, "laeti sitis, nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate."

Comment. in Mich. (A.D. 392) *B. II. c. VII.* (Vallars. Vol. VI. p. 520.) Qui legerit Canticum Canticorum, et sponsum animae,

[1] Origen. This passage perhaps refers to the Temptation. See Mat. iv. and Mark i. 12. See below for Jerome's quotation (Jerome, Comment. in Mich. VII. 6). Origen omits "by one of my hairs" in his second quotation.

[1] Eusebius. Prof. Lee's transl. of Syriac Version of Theophania. Nicholson, p. 6.

[2] Gospel of the Hebrews. Hilg. says this reference was first noticed by Fritsche. Nicholson, p. 6.

Dei sermonem intellexerit, credideritque Evangelio, quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus (in quo ex persona Salvatoris dicitur: *Modo tulit me mater mea, Sanctus Spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum*), non dubitabit dicere Sermonem Dei ortum esse de Spiritu, et animam, quae sponsa Sermonis est, habere socrum Sanctum Spiritum, qui apud Hebraeos genere dicitur feminino "RUA." . . . Et ne forte dubites Verbum et Filium nasci de Spiritu Sancto, Gabrielis ad Mariam verba considera: *Spiritus Sanctus veniet super te, etc.*[1]

De Vir. Ill. c. 2. (A.D. 392.) Evangelium quoque, quod appellatum secundum Hebraeos et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur.[2]

Ibid. c. 3. See before, p. 139 and Note 1. (*The Hebrew original of Matthew in Cesarea. The Nazarenes in Beroea use it.*)

Comment. in Isai. B. XI. c. xl. 11. (A.D. 410). (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 485.) Sed et in Evangelio *quod juxta Hebraeos scriptum Nazaraei lectitant*, Dominus loquitur: *Modo tulit me mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.* Nemo autem in hac parte scandalizari debet, quod dicatur apud Hebraeos spiritus genere feminino, quum nostra lingua appelletur genere masculino, et Graeco sermone, neutro. In divinitate enim nullus est sexus.

Comment. in Mat. II. 6. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 14.) Bethlehem Judaeae: librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primo editum, sicut *in ipso Hebraico legimus* Judae, non Judaeae. . . .

[1] Jerome. The Elkesaites represented the Holy Spirit as a female principle. (Hippol. Ref. Haer. IX. 13. p. 462, and Epiph. Haer. 19. 4; 53. 1.) It appears as in the Clem. Hom. (III. 20-27) that Christ was regarded as the male principle and the Holy Spirit as the female principle. The Spirit "brooded over the deep," &c. The 'Helena' of Simon, the 'Sophia' of Valentinus, and the 'Philoumena' of Apelles, are names given by Gnostics to a female principle, by no means corresponding, however, to the Holy Spirit as represented in Scripture. The worship of the Virgin Mary in the middle ages may show the result of the same tendency. See Baring Gould's 'Lost and Hostile Gospels,' p. 132.

[2] The quotations of Origen from the G. H. by name are only the two given above. The early portion of his Homilies on Matthew is lost. The Latin translation of what remains begins in c. XIII. But Jerome is not likely to be mistaken in this statement that Origen often used the G. H. His knowledge of the text of that Gospel would enable Jerome to identify some quotations in Origen of which the source is not stated. See list of those quotations in Nicholson, G. H. p. 143.

Ibid. VI. 11. In Evangelio quod *appellatur secundum Hebraeos. . . .*

Ibid. XII. 13. In Evangelio, *quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae,* quod *nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum. . . .*

Ibid. XXIII. 35. In Evangelio, *quo utuntur Nazareni,* pro filio Barachiae, . . . (Mat. xxiii. 35.)

Ibid. XXVII. 16. Iste (Barrabas) in Evangelio, quod *scribitur juxta Hebraeos, . . .*

Ibid. c. 51. In Evangelio *cujus saepe fecimus mentionem,* superliminare . . .

Comment. in Isai. XI. 2. (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 156.) Juxta Evangelium, quod *Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei, "descendit super eum omnis fons* (יצר) *Spiritus Sancti."* . . .

Comment. in Ezech. XVIII. 7. (A.D. 413). (Vallars. Vol. V. p. 207.) Et in Evangelio quod juxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt, . . .

Adv. Pelag. III. 2. (A.D. 416). (Vallars. Vol. II. p. 768.) *In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis literis*[3] scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthaeum . . .

Epist. ad Hedib. (after A.D. 398). (Vallars. Vol. I. p. 825.) In Evangelio, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum est, legimus, . . .

9. Theodoret (A.D. 451-458).

Haer. Fab. II. 1. (Ebionites). *Μόνον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ἑβιωναίους Εὐαγγέλιον δέχονται.*

Ibid. (Ebionites.) *Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον κέχρηνται μόνῳ.*

10. Nicephorus (A.D. 758-828).

See before, p. 29.

[3] See before, pp. 139, 140, where he says it was written *Hebraicis literis verbisque.*

11. Epiphanius.

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 29. *p.* 124. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 405.) Ἔχουσι δὲ (sc. οἱ Ναζαραίοι) τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί. Παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη, Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔτι σώζεται. Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον.

Ibid. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 126. See before, p. 139. (*Ebionites receive Matthew's Gospel, and call it 'according to the Hebrew's.'*)

Ibid. p. 130. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 416.) Ὁ Ἰώσηπος[1] λεληθότως τολμήσας ἤνοιξε, καὶ εὗρεν οὐδὲν χρημάτων, πλὴν βίβλους τὰς ὑπὲρ χρήματα· ἀναγινώσκων δὲ ἐν ταύταις ὡς ἤδη ἔφην τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ Ἑλλάδος εἰς Ἑβραΐδα φωνὴν μεταληφθὲν ηὕρατο, καὶ τὰς τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πράξεις. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Ἑβραϊκὸν φύσει ὂν ἐκ τούτων ἀναγνοὺς πάλιν τὴν διάνοιαν ἐτρύχετο.

Ibid. h. 46. *p.* 391. (*Speaking of Tatian.*) Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινες καλοῦσι.[2]

B. QUOTATIONS FROM THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS IN ITS NAZARENE OR ITS EBIONITE FORM.[1]

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 137. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 426.) Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ

[1] Epiphanius. Josephus, a Jewish Christian of the time of Constantine.

[2] Epiphanius must be mistaken here. Hegesippus could scarcely have quoted from the Gospel of the Hebrews if it had been Tatian's.

[1] In collecting and arranging the following passages use has been made of Fabricius's Codex Apocryphus; Kleuker, Ausführliche Untersuchung der Gründe für die Aechtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der schriftlichen Urkunden des Christenthums (1793); Hilgenfeld's 'Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum;' Baring Gould's 'Lost and Hostile Gospels;' and especially of the latest and completest work on the subject, Nicholson's 'Gospel of the Hebrews.' There are many other books with discussions of the perplexing subject which may be consulted with profit: Supernatural Religion, Dr Roberts's Discussions on the Gospels, and his more recent work 'The Gospels,' being those which I have found most suggestive. See also Lardner's works, and the notes on Clement of Rome, 2nd Epistle, in Lightfoot's and Gebhardt & Harnack's editions.

οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ, καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ (Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν), ἐμφέρεται, ὅτι ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα (Luke iii. 23), ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε· παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος (Mat. iv. 18) ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καί σε τὸν Ματθαῖον[2] καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου (Mat. ix. 9) ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὸν ὀσφῦν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησὶ, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ, (Mat. iii. 4-7) ἵνα δῆθεν μεταστρέψωσι τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν λόγον εἰς ψεῦδος, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκρίδων ποιήσωσιν ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι. Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίου ἔχει ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήλθοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες.

Ibid. Καὶ[3] μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα "σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα." Καὶ πάλιν "ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε." Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα.[4] Ὃν ἰδὼν, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ "σὺ τίς εἶ, Κύριε;" Καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν

[2] Epiphanius names only eight disciples, though he speaks of twelve. This is characteristic of his carelessness.

[3] This is a continuation in Epiphanius of what went before in Extract 1.

[4] See before, p. 126, note 5, on Justin's reference to the fire and the descent of the Spirit. Justin's correspondence with this form is not verbal. In Jerome's version below the supernatural appearances are referred, as here, to our Lord's coming up from the water. It will be observed that there is no little divergence between Epiphanius and Jerome.

"οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ἠὐδόκησα." Καὶ τότε, φησὶν, Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε "δέομαί σου, Κύριε· σύ με βάπτισον." Ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ (ἐκώλυσεν αὐτὸν Dind.), λέγων "ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα." (Mat. iii. 14-17 and Heb. i. 5; v. 5.)

Ibid. p. 138. Παρακύψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προείπομεν, λέγοντες ὅτι "ἐγένετο," φησὶν, "ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ Ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα,[5] ἦλθέ τις Ἰωάννης ὀνόματι βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ," καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

Jerome, Comment. in Isai. B. IV. c. xi. 2. (Vallars. Vol. IV. p. 155.) Illud quod in Evangelio Matthaei omnes quaerunt Ecclesiastici, et non inveniunt ubi scriptum sit, *Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur,* eruditi Hebraeorum de hoc loco assumptum putant. . . . Super hunc igitur florem, qui de trunco et de radice Jesse per Mariam virginem repente consurget, requiescet Spiritus Domini, quia in ipso complacuit omnem plenitudinem divinitatis habitare corporaliter: nequaquam per partes, ut in caeteris Sanctis, sed juxta Evangelium eorum, quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazarei: *Descendit super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti.* . . . Porro in Evangelio, cujus supra fecimus mentionem, haec scripta reperimus: *Factum est autem quum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis exspectabam te, ut venires, et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.*[6]

Id. Comment. in Ezech. B. VI. c. xviii. (Vallars. Vol. V. p. 207.) Et in Evangelio quod juxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris[7] sui spiritum contristaverit. (Mat. v. 24; compare xviii. 6, 7.)

Id. Comment. in Eph. B. III. c. v. 4. (Vallars. Vol. VII.

[5] Epiphanius here gives another copy of the opening words not verbally identical with what he gave on the previous page.

[6] The want of verbal correspondence between Epiphanius and Jerome in their transcripts of the Gospel, is one of the many perplexities the student must meet.

[7] Matthew frequently uses 'brother' in this sense, Luke seldom, Mark never. See next extract.

p. 641.) Verum et haec a sanctis viris penitus propellenda, quibus magis convenit flere atque lugere, ut in Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus, Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: *Et nunquam,* inquit, *laeti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate.* (Compare Mat. as in last extract.)

Id. Comment. in Mat. B. I. c. vi. 11. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 34.) In Evangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, pro *supersubstantiali* pane, reperi *Mahar,* quod dicitur *crastinum,* ut sit sensus: *panem nostrum crasticum,* id est, *futurum da nobis hodie.*

Ibid. B. II. c. xii. 13. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 77.) In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazaraei et Ebionitae, (quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum) homo iste, qui aridam habet manum caementarius scribitur; istius modi vocibus auxilium precans: Caementarius eram manibus victum quaeritans; precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos. (Mat. xii. 10, &c.)

Irenaeus, B. I. 25. 4. (According to Irenaeus, Carpocrates used the following of which (*"Quum es cum adversario tuo, &c."*) we find apparently the Greek in Epiphanius *I. t.* 2. *h.* 27. *p.* 106. *Ὅπερ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ εἶπε διὰ τῆς παραβολῆς ὅτι ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ἐν ᾧ εἶ ἐν τῷ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ, μή πως ὁ ἀντίδικος παραδῷ σε τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ ὁ ὑπηρέτης βάλῃ σε εἰς τὴν φυλακήν. Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην.* (Compare Luke xii. 58, 59.)

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 151. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 449.) *Καὶ δῆτα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σύστασιν ταύτης βούλονται φέρειν, ὡς καὶ οἱ περὶ Κήρινθον. Φασὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων ληρώδη λόγον ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ εἶναι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος. Περιετμήθη, φασὶν, ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ σὺ περιτμήθητι.* (Mat. x. 25.)

Eus. Theophania. (Lee's Edition IV. 13. p. 234.) "I will choose me the good, those good whom my Father in the heavens (*pater meus coelestis* Hilgenf.) hath given me."[8]

Clem. Strom. See before, p. 9.

[8] See Hilg. p. 16, and Nicholson, p. 45. "Father in heaven," an expression almost confined to Matthew's Gospel.

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 138. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 429.) *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ βούλονται τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν ὄντως εἶναι ἄνθρωπον. Ὡς προεῖπον, Χριστὸν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς καταβεβηκότα, καθάπερ ἤδη καὶ παρ᾽ ἄλλαις αἱρεσιν εὑρίσκομεν συναφθέντα αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς γεγεννημένον. Πάλιν δὲ ἀρνοῦνται εἶναι αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον δῆθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου οὗ εἶρηκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ ἀναγγελῆναι αὐτῳ ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασιν, ὅτι τίς μου ἐστὶ μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοί; καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἔφη· Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ* (καὶ ἀδελφοὶ Dind.) *οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου.* (Mat. xii. 47-50. Compare Mark iii. 32; Luke viii. 20.)

Orig. de Princ. IV. 22. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 388.) *Ἐπὰν φάσκῃ ὁ Σωτὴρ 'οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ,' οὐκ ἐκλαμβάνομεν ταῦτα ὡς οἱ πτωχοὶ*[9] *τῇ διανοίᾳ Ἐβιωναῖοι τῆς πτωχείας τῆς διανοίας ἐπώνυμοι· Ἐβίων γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς παρ᾽ Ἑβραίοις ὀνομάζεται· ὥστε ὑπολαβεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς σαρκίνους Ἰσραηλίτας προηγουμένως τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιδεδημηκέναι.* (Mat. xv. 24.)

Jerome, Adv. Pelag. B. III. c. 2. (Vallars. Vol. II. p. 768.) In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur Bibliotheca, narrat historia: *Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum: eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi, ignorantia est.*

Ibid. Et in eodem volumine: Si peccaverit, inquit, frater tuus in verbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus: septies in die? Respondit Dominus et dixit ei: Etiam ego dico tibi, usque septuagies septies. Etenim in prophetis quoque postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est sermo peccati. (Compare Mat. xviii. 22, and Luke xvii. 4.)[10]

[9] Origen plays on the name Ebionite or Poor. See, for this origin of the name, Introduction, Gospel of Hebrews.

[10] The margin of Tischendorf's MS has Τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν (sc. εὐαγγέλιον) ἐξῆς ἔχει μετὰ τὸ "ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά" "καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις μετὰ τὸ χρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ εὑρισκέτω (l. εὑρίσκεται) ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγος ἁμαρτίας."

Eus. H. E. III. 39. (The narrative of the woman accused of many crimes.) (See John vii. 53-viii. 11.?)

Epiph. Haer. I. t. 2. *h.* 30. *p.* 146. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 441.) *Καὶ ἐποίησαν τοὺς μαθητὰς μὲν λέγοντας· Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν; Καὶ αὐτὸν δῆθεν λέγοντα· Μὴ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν;*[11]

Origen, Comment. in Mat. tom. XV. § 14. *p.* 672. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 1293.) Scriptum est in Evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos: si tamen placet alicui recipere illud non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis. "Dixit," inquit, "ad eum alter divitum: Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam? Dixit ei: Homo, leges et prophetas fac. Respondit ad eum: Feci. Dixit ei: Vade, vende omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus et veni sequere me. Coepit autem dives scalpere caput suum, et non placuit ei. Et dixit ad eum Dominus: Quomodo dicis, legem feci et prophetas? quoniam scriptum est in lege, Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum; et ecce, multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt stercore morientes prae fame; et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ad eos. Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo sedenti apud se: Simon, fili Joanne, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus, quam divitem in regnum coelorum." (Mat. xix. 16-24.)[12]

Jerome, Letter 20 *to Damasus.* (Vallars. Vol. I. p. 64.) Denique Matthaeus, qui Evangelium Hebraeo sermone conscripsit, ita posuit *Osanna Baramma,* id est *Osanna in excelsis.* (Mat. xxi. 9.)

Id. in Mat. xxiii. 35. Pro filio Barachiae, filium Jojadae reperimus, &c. See before, p. 455.

Eus. Theophania. (See Migne, Vol. VI. p. 685.) *Τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἦκον Ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν Εὐαγγέλιον τὴν ἀπειλὴν οὐ κατὰ τοῦ ἀποκρύψαντος ἐπῆγεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοῦ ἀσώτως ἐξηκότος. Τρεῖς*

[11] Compare Luke xxii. 15. By adding κρέας and making the words a question the Ebionites (like the Essenes) avowed their own aversion from animal food. In the same way the alteration of ἀκρίδας into ἐγχρίδας (see above, first extract from Epiphanius) was a deliberate change in favour of their own views.

[12] See on Justin's quotations of this before, p. 116. The Clem. Hom. 18. 3. 17 make it, "call me not good."

γὰρ δούλους περιεῖχε, τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὴν ὕπαρξιν μετὰ πορνῶν καὶ αὐλητρίδων, τὸν δὲ πολλαπλασιάσαντα τὴν ἐργασίαν, τὸν δὲ κατακρύψαντα τὸ τάλαντον· εἶτα τὸν μὲν ἀποδεχθῆναι, τὸν δὲ μεμφθῆναι μόνον, τὸν δὲ συγκλεισθῆναι δεσμωτηρίῳ. (Mat. xxv. 14.)

Jerome, Comment. in Mat. B. IV. c. xxvii. 16. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 219.) Iste (Barabbas) in Evangelio, quod *scribitur juxta Hebraeos, filius magistri eorum* interpretatur, qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus.

Ibid. c. 51. (Vallars. Vol. VII. p. 233.) In Evangelio, cujus saepe fecimus mentionem, superliminare Templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus.

Id. Epist. ad Hedib. (Vallars. Vol. I. p. 825.) In Evangelio, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum est, legimus, non velum Templi scissum, sed superliminare templi mirae magnitudinis corruisse.

Id. De Vir. Ill. c. 2. (Vallars. Vol. II p. 817.) Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem servo Sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus. Rursusque post paulum: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur: Tulit panem et benedixit, ac fregit, et dedit Jacobo justo, et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.

Ignat. Ep. Smyrn. c. 3. (See before, p. 111 and Note 3.)

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 16. (Vallars. Vol. II. p. 842.) Scripsit (sc. Ignatius) et ad Smyrnaeos et proprie ad Polycarpum, commendans illi Antiochensem Ecclesiam in qua et de Evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium, dicens: *Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi et credo, quia sit.* Et quando venit ad Petrum, et ad eos, qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis: *Ecce palpate me, et videte, quia non sum daemonium incorporale.* (Luke xxiv. 39.) *Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt.*

Id. Comment. in Isai. B. XVIII. Prooem. (Vallars. Vol. IV.

p. 769.) Quum enim Apostoli eum putarent *spiritum* vel juxta Evangelium, quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazaraei, *incorporale daemonium,* dixit eis: *quid turbati estis,* &c.?

Additional quotations or references.

Origen, Comment. in Joann. See before, p. 452.

Jerome, in Es. xl. 11. See before, p. 454.

Id. in Mich. vii. 6. See before, p. 453, and compare Origen, before, p. 453.

Clem. Alex. Strom. II. 9. See before, p. 452.

Epiph. Haer. XXX. 16. *Φάσκουσι . . . καὶ ἐλθόντα, καὶ ὑφηγησάμενον* (*ὡς τὸ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει*) *ὅτι ἦλθεν,*[13] *καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν οὐ παύσεται ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή.*

[13] See Eus. H. E. III. 36 for quotation of those words as in Ignatius (ἐλήλυθεν for ἦλθεν). Jerome may have quoted from Eusebius, but if so he does not quote exactly. It is doubtful where the quotation ends in Ignatius. The passage in Origen which refers to this (see Note on p. 111) is De Princ. Prol. c. 8.

2. PROTEVANGELIUM JACOBI

OR

GOSPEL OF JAMES.[1]

Clem. Alex. Strom. VII. 16. p. 889. *Ἀλλ' ὡς ἔοικεν τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μεχρὶ νῦν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριὰμ λεχὼ εἶναι, διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γέννησιν οὐκ οὖσα λεχώ· καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσάν φασί τινες παρθένον εὑρεθῆναι.*

Justin Martyr, Dial. c. 78. p. 303. See before, p. 121, Note 21.

Origen, Comment. in Mat. p. 463. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 876.) *Τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ, φασί τινες εἶναι, ἐκ παραδόσεως ὁρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίου, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ, κ.τ.λ.*

3. ACTS OF PILATE.[1]

Justin Martyr, Apol. I. 35. *p.* 76 *C. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ σταυρῶσαι αὐτὸν, ἔβαλον κλῆρον ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμερίσαντο ἑαυτοῖς οἱ σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν. Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἄκτων.* (John xx. 25; Mat. xxvii. 35.)[2]

Ibid. I. 48. *p.* 84 *C. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ θεραπεύειν πάσας νόσους*

[1] James. See Introduction, "Apocrypha," and note on page 156. The argument on Canonicity founded on those Apocryphal Books—the Protevangelium and the Acts of Pilate—is that they are obviously expansions of our Gospels, and that—they being in existence before the middle of the second century—they furnish an argument for the antiquity of the Gospels.

[1] Acts of Pilate. See Introduction, "Apocrypha." Our quotations indicate the importance attached to this book by Justin and others. It undoubtedly follows the Gospels, notably John. See note on page 174.

[2] The casting of lots by the soldiers is not mentioned in the Acts of Pilate now extant; the division of the garments is.

καὶ νεκροὺς ἀναγερεῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη ἀκούσατε τῶν λελεγμένων. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα· τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἁλεῖται χῶλος ὡς ἐλαφὸς καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν. Ὅτι τε ταῦτα ἐποίησεν, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων Ἄκτων μαθεῖν δύνασθε. (Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6; Mat. xi. 5.)

Tertullian, Apologet. c. 21. Et tamen suffixus multa mortis illius propria ostendit insignia. Nam spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit, praevento carnificis officio. Eodem momento dies medium orbem signante sole subducta est. Deliquium utique putaverunt, qui id quoque super Christo praedicatum non scierunt. *Et tamen eum mundi casum relatum in arcanis vestris habetis.* ... Cum discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galileam, Judaeae regionem, ad quadraginta dies egit docens cos quae docerent. Dehinc ordinatis eis ad officium praedicandi per orbem circumfusa nube in coelum est receptus, multo verius quam apud vos adseverare de Romulo Proculi solent. *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Caesari tunc Tiberio nuntiavit.*

Eus. H. E. II. 2. *Τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας ἤδη καθ' ὅλης τῆς Παλαιστίνης βεβοημένα Πιλάτος Τιβερίῳ βασιλεῖ κοινοῦνται, κ.τ.λ.* (Eus. rests upon Tertullian l. c.)

Epiph. Haer. II. t. 1. *h.* 50. *p.* 420. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 884.) Ἕτεροι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν (sc. *τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατιτῶν*) τὴν αὐτὴν μίαν ἡμέραν ἄγονται καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μίαν ἡμέραν νηστεύοντες καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντες, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἄκτων δῆθεν Πιλάτου αὐχοῦσι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ηὑρηκέναι, ἐν οἷς ἐμφέρεται τῇ πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι. ... Ἔτι δὲ ηὕραμεν ἀντίγραφα Ἄκτων Πιλάτου, ἐν οἷς σημαίνει πρὸ δεκαπέντε καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸ πάθος γεγενῆσθαι. Τἀληθῆ δὲ, ὡς ἐκ πολλῆς ἀκριβείας ἔγνωμεν, ἐν τῇ πρὸ δεκατριῶν καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα πεπονθέναι κατειλήφαμεν.

4. GOSPEL OF PETER.[1]

PETER'S DOCTRINE. PETER'S PREACHING.

Eus. H. E. VI. 12. Ἕτερός τε συντεταγμένος αὐτῷ (sc. Σαραπίωνι) λόγος περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίου, ὃν πεποίηται ἀπελέγχων τὰ ψευδῶς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρημένα, διά τινας ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ῥωσσὸν παροικίᾳ, προφάσει τῆς εἰρημένης γρα-

[1] On the works ascribed to Peter see the Testimony of Eusebius, before, p. 207. Jerome also in his De Vir. Ill. c. 1 says, "*Libri autem ejus, e quibus unus Actorum ejus inscribitur, alius Evangelii, tertius Praedicationis, quartus Apocalypseos, quintus Judicii, inter Apocryphas scripturas reputantur.*" The decree of Gelasius (see before, p. 24) condemns Peter's Gospel. It appears probable from the extracts in the text that this Gospel taught the ordinary human birth of Jesus; although this is not quite clear. But it agreed with the Protevangelium (the 'Book of James') in regarding the "brethren" of Jesus as sons of Joseph by a former marriage. The 'Nazarenes' who, according to Theodoret, used it, must have been more Jewish than some of their name, since they regarded Christ as only a just man. What Origen quotes from it (regarding Christ not being a bodiless demon) is found in the Nazarene Gospel; and on the whole it seems to have been a recension of the Gospel of the Hebrews. Hilgenf. (N. T. extra Can. rec.) believes it to be older than the Ebionite Gospel. There is a passage in Justin (Dial. c. 106; see before, p. 62, Note 6) where it is said that mention of the change of Peter's name is made ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ. From the immediately following reference to the change of the names of the Sons of Zebedee (which is only found in Mark) it has been usually supposed that Justin refers to Mark's Gospel as his authority. This is not clear, however. There is no reason to deny that from this passage alone a good case could be made out for there being a book called 'Peter's Memoirs' (although those who plead that case are almost bound to hold that "Memoirs" is the equivalent of "Gospel"), and we are not concerned to deny that Justin might have known and quoted such a book; but it is scarcely possible on this one fact to build a whole theory as to the nature of Peter's Gospel, and still less is it possible to refer to that Gospel all Justin's quotations from 'The Memoirs.' The 'Doctrine of Peter' Διδαχὴ Πέτρου was probably the same work. There is another name, Peter's Preaching, Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, which is sometimes called 'The Preaching of Peter and Paul.' The words of Lactantius are evidence of its existence in his day: "*Sed et futura illis aperuit omnia, quae Petrus et Paulus Romae praedicaverunt, et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit, in qua cum alia mira tum etiam hoc . . .*" (here follows a prediction of the fall of the Jews and their cities). It is chiefly known through the frequent quotations of it by Clem. Alex., some of which, referring to the New Testament, are in our text. Origen (Comment. in Joann. t. 13. § 17. Migne, Vol. IV. p. 424) says that Heracleon quoted it. Both Eusebius and Jerome distinguish the 'Preaching of Peter' from the 'Gospel of Peter.' What relation it had to the account of Peter's Preaching in the Clementines is a difficult question. The extracts which remain in Clem. Alex. and others do not identify the two works, nor is Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. extr. Can. rec. p. 55) able to make out a case for the identity. Credner ascribed the Preaching to the end of the First Century; and regarded it (Hilgenfeld following him) as the parent of the Homilies and Recognitions. See the whole discussion in Credner's Beiträge, p. 348, &c.). An Apocalypse of Peter is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment.

φῆς εἰς ἑτεροδόξους διδασκαλίας ἀποκείλαντας. Ἀφ' ἧς εὔλογον βραχείας παραθέσθαι λέξεις, δι' ὧν ἦν εἶχε περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου γνώμην προτίθησιν, οὕτω γράφων· Ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν· τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμενος παρ' ὑμῖν ὑπενόουν τοὺς πάντας ὀρθῇ πίστει προσφέρεσθαι, καὶ μὴν διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὀνόματι Πέτρου Εὐαγγέλιον, εἶπον. Ὅτι εἰ τοῦτό ἐστι μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω. Νῦν δὲ μαθὼν ὅτι αἱρέσει τινὶ ὁ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐνεφώλευεν ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι, σπουδάσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ὥς τε ἀδελφοὶ προσδοκᾶτέ με ἐν τάχει. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀδελφοὶ, καταλαβόμενοι, ὁποίας ἦν αἱρέσεως ὁ Μαρκιανὸς, καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἰναντιοῦτο μὴ νοῶν ἃ ἐλάλει, ἃ μαθήσεσθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη. Ἐδυνήθημεν γὰρ παρ' ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, τουτέστι παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν (τὰ γὰρ πλείονα φρονήματα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας), χρησάμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν, διελθεῖν, καὶ εὑρεῖν τὰ μὲν πλείονα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου τοῦ Σωτῆρος, τινὰ δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα, ἃ καὶ ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ Σαραπίωνος.

Origen, Comment. in Mat. t. 10. *c.* 17. *p.* 462. (Migne, Vol. III. p. 876.) Ὥιοντο οὖν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας υἱόν· τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς Ἰησοῦ, φασί τινες εἶναι, ἐκ παραδόσεως ὁρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίου, ἢ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ ἐκ πρωτέρας γυναικὸς, συνῳκηκυίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας. (Compare Mat. xiii. 55, 56, and Mark vi. 3.)

Id. de Princip. I. Praef. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 119.) Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libello, qui *Petri Doctrina* appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere: "Non sum daemonium incorporeum," primo respondendum est ei, quoniam ille liber inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur, et ostendendum, quia neque Petri est ipsa (ista? Zahn) scriptura, neque alterius cujusquam, qui spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus.

Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 41. (Vallars. Voll. II. p. 869.) Composuit (Serapion) et alium de *Evangelio,* quod sub *nomine Petri* fertur librum ad Rhodensem Ciliciae ecclesiam, quae in haeresin ejus lectione diverterat.

Theodoret. B. II. Fab. 2. Οἱ δὲ Ναζωραῖοι Ἰουδαῖοί εἰσι τὸν Χριστὸν τιμῶντες ὡς ἄνθρωπον δίκαιον καὶ τῷ καλουμένῳ κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίῳ κεχρημένοι.[1]

Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 29. *p.* 427. (also II. 15. p. 465.) Ἐν δὲ τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι εὕροις ἂν νόμον καὶ λόγον τὸν Κύριον προσαγορευόμενον.

Ibid. VI. 5. *p.* 762. Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις· "Ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τις θελήσῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. Μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μή τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν."

Ibid. VI. 6. 48. *p.* 764. Ἐν τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι ὁ Κύριός φησι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν "ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητὰς, κρίνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ, οὓς ὁ Κύριος ἠθέλησεν καὶ Ἀποστόλοις πιστοὺς ἡγησάμενος εἶναι," κ.τ.λ.

Ibid. VI. 15. *p.* 804. Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι περὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων λέγων φησίν· Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀναπτύξαντες τὰς βίβλους ἃς εἴχομεν τῶν προφητῶν ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἃ δὲ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἃ δὲ αὐθεντικῶς καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ὀνομαζόντων, εὕρομεν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πάσας ὅσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν πρὸ τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα κτισθῆναι, καθὼς ἐγέγραπτο. Ταῦτα πάντα ἃ ἔδει αὐτὸν παθεῖν καὶ μετὰ αὐτὸν ἃ ἔσται. Ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιγνόντες ἐπιστεύσαμεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτόν.

5. GOSPEL OF THE EGYPTIANS.

Clem. Rom. 2 *Epistle.* See before, p. 108.

Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 13. *p.* 553. See before, p. 75.[1]

Ibid. c. 6. *p.* 532. Τῇ Σαλώμῃ ὁ Κύριος πυνθανομένῃ, "μέχρι πότε θάνατος ἰσχύσει;" οὐχ, ὡς κακοῦ τοῦ βίου ὄντος

[1] Theodoret goes on to say that "Justin, philosopher and martyr," wrote against the Nazarenes; and also Irenaeus τῶν Ἀποστόλων διάδοχος, and Origen.

[1] These two passages refer to the same saying, and Clem. Alex. says it is from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. On this Gospel see Introduction.

καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πονηρᾶς, "μέχρις ἂν," εἶπεν, "ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτητε," ἀλλ' ὡς τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τὴν φυσικὴν διδάσκων· γενέσει γὰρ πάντως ἕπεται καὶ φθορά.

Ibid. c. 8. *p.* 540. Οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῇ κτίσει τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς εὐφήμου ἐγκρατείας, κἀκεῖνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένα, ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθημεν· φέρεται δὲ οἶμαι ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Εὐαγγελίῳ. Φασὶ γὰρ, ὅτι "αὐτὸς εἶπεν ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας·" θηλείας μὲν, τῆς ἐπιθυμίας· ἔργα δὲ, γένεσιν καὶ φθοράν.

Ibid. c. 9. *p.* 540. Ὅθεν εἰκότως περὶ συντελείας μηνύσαντος τοῦ λόγου ἡ Σαλώμη φησί· "μέχρι τίνος οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀποθανοῦνται;" . . . ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Κύριος· "μέχρις ἂν τίκτωσιν αἱ γυναῖκες."[2]

Ibid. p. 541. Τί δέ; οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς τῶν πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένων ἐπιφέρουσιν οἱ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐαγγελικῷ στοιχήσαντες κανόνι; Φαμένης γὰρ αὐτῆς, καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα"· ὡς οὐ δεόντως τῆς γενέσεως παραλαμβανομένης· ἀμείβεται λέγων ὁ Κύριος, πᾶσαν φάγε βοτανήν· τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσαν μὴ φάγῃς.

Orig. Hom. in Luc. See before, p. 82.

Epiph. Haer. II. t. 1. *h.* 62. *p.* 514. Τὴν δὲ πᾶσαν αὐτῶν πλάνην καὶ τὴν τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἀποκρύφων τινῶν, μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ καλουμένου Αἰγυπτίου Εὐαγγελίου, ᾧ τινες τὸ ὄνομα ἐπέθεντο τοῦτο· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς ἐν παραβύστῳ μυστηριωδῶς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναφέρεται, ὡς αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Υἱὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

Jerome, Comment. in Mat. Prooem. See before, p. 99.

[2] See reference to the same saying in Clem. Alex. Excerpta ex Theod. 67. p. 985, Ὅταν ὁ Σωτὴρ πρὸς Σαλώμην λέγῃ, μέχρι τότε εἶναι θάνατον, ἄχρις ἂν αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτωσιν. See also Orac. Sibyll. II. 163, 164, Νήπιοι οὐδὲ νοοῦντες ὀϑ' ἡνίκα φῦλα γυναικῶν μὴ τίκτωσιν ἔφυ τὸ θέρος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων. (Quoted by Hilgenf.)

PASSAGES OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN OCCURRING IN EARLY WRITERS.[1]

Clem. Alex. Strom. II. 9. See before, under Gospel of the Hebrews p. 452.

Ibid. I. 28. *p.* 425. "*Γίνεσθε δὲ δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται,*"[2] *τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες.* (Comp. 1 Thess. v. 21.)

From Tract. Schabbath XVI. (See Hilg. p. 16.)

לֹא לְמִפְחַת נִין אוֹרַיְתָא דְמשֶׁה אֲתִיתִי אֶלָּא לְאוֹסְפֵי (V. 17)
עַל אוֹרַיְתָא דְמשֶׁה אֲתִיתִי:בְּרָא וּבְרַתָא כַּחֲדָא
יְרָתוּן (V. 27-32)

Acts, xi. 2-4.[3] *Λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος· Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ, οἱ λέγοντες· Ταῦτα πάλαι ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἑωράκαμεν. Ἀνόητοι, συμ-*

[1] In the text are here inserted, as interesting to students, some passages which have not been included in the extracts in this Book. For other passages which cannot be referred to our Gospels, and which occur without reference to the source from which they are taken, see on pages 107, 108 the extracts from "2 Clement," c. 4, 5; c. 5. 2-4; c. 8, 5; c. 12, 2, on pages 125-127 the extracts from Justin Martyr, Dial. c. 35; c. 47; c. 51; c. 69; c. 88; c. 106. See several also under the "Clementine Homilies," especially the references to III. 50, 53, 56; XII. 29; XVI. 21; XIX. 20.

[2] See before, p. 82 and note. The words occur in Clem. Hom. II, 51; III. 50; XVIII. 20; Const. App. II. 36, 37; Epiph. Haer. 44. 2; Orig. in Joann. Tom. XIX. 2 (Opp. IV. 283)—ἐντολὴ Ἰησοῦ; Dion. Alex. apud Eus. H. E. VII. 7. 3—ἀποστολικὴ φωνή; Jerome, Ep. 119 (or 152) *Salvatoris verba dicentis estote probati nummularii.* See Hilgenf., Ev. sec. Heb., p. 27.

[3] See before, p. 108, Note 10.

βάλετε ἑαυτοὺς ζύλῳ, λάβετε ἄμπελον· πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ, εἶτα βλαστὸς γίνεται, μετὰ ταῦτα ὄμφαξ, εἶτα σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυῖα· οὕτως καὶ ὁ λαός μου ἀκαταστασίας καὶ θλίψεις ἔσχεν, ἔπειτα ἀπολήψεται τὰ ἀγαθά.

Ibid. xii. 2. See before, p. 108.

Ibid. xx. 35. *Μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε, Μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν.*

Origen, De Orat. 2. (Migne, Vol. I. p. 417.) *Εἶπε γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· Αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.* (Mat. vi. 33.)

Comp. Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 24. *p.* 416. *Αἰτεῖσθε γάρ, φησὶ, τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται.*

Cod. D. Luke VI. 4 &c. (from Tisch. Gr. Test). *Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης τοῦ νόμου.*

Id. in Mat. xx. 28 &c. (from Tisch. Gr. Test). *Ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. Εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπελθῇ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἰπῇ σοι· Ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ. Ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπεσῇς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον, καὶ ἐπελθῇ σου ἥττων ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· Σύναγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον.*

Justin Mart. Apol. I. 38. *p.* 77 *D.* See before, p. 63, Note 4.

Id. Dial. C. 101. *p.* 328 *C.* See before, p. 63.

Origen, Hom. in Jerem. XX. 3. (Migne, Vol. III p. 531.) Legi alicubi—quasi Salvatore dicente—et quaero sive quis personam figurarit Salvatoris, sive in memoriam adduxerit ac verum sit hoc quod dictum est—ait autem ipse Salvator, "Qui juxta me est, juxta ignem est: qui longe a me est, longe est a regno."

JENA: PRINTED BY ED. FROMMANN.

ERRATA.

Page	4, line	4,	*for*	& uobis,	*read* uobis &.
"	6, "	10,	insert comma after		"fuit"
"	14, "	9,	*for*	ἐπληφορήθημεν,	*read* ἐπληροφορήθημεν.
"	18, "	18,	"	Ἰωάννου β′γ′,	" Ἰωάννου α′β′γ′.
"	21, "	5,	"	Hæres. Tom. I. p. 941,	" Migne, II. 460.
"	26, "	8,	"	κρατυθεντα,	" κρατυθέντα.
"	26, "	12,	"	Κλεόβιον,	" Κλεόβιον.
"	44, n. 2, l. 7,	"		Rhosse,	" Rhossus.
"	45, line	12,	"	Πάτερα,	" Πατέρα.
"	46, "	12,	"	Κύριου,	" Κυρίου.
"	46, "	13,	"	δυναμέων,	" δυνάμεων.
"	51, "	2,	omit comma after		"εὐαγγέλιον"
"	54, "	18,	*for*	*H. E. III.* 40,	*read* *H. E. III.* 39.
"	54, "	23,	"	ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ,	" ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ.
"	59, "	29,	"	"MEMOIRS,"	" AUTHORITIES.
"	62, "	4,	"	CLAIMS TO CITE THE MEMOIRS,	" CITES HIS AUTHORITIES.
"	62, n. 1, l. 12,	"		words are found,	" words were found.
"	64, line	7,	after	συντετάχθαι, insert	γέγραπται.
"	64, "	14,	*for*	*Dial. c.* 106,	*read* *Dial. c.* 105.
"	73, n. 1, l. 17,	"		II. 26,	" III. 26.
"	75, line	12,	insert period after		"προτρέψασθαι"
"	75, "	16,	*for*	*Strom. III.* 553,	*read* *III.* 13. 91, 92, p. 553.
"	125, n. 1, l. 5,	"		XVI. 2,	" XVI. 21.
"	126, n. 2, l. 5,	insert comma after			"Hebrews"
"	127, n. 5, l. 8,	after "books," substitute comma for colon.			
"	134, line	2,	*for*	*Strom. I.* 409,	*read* *Strom. I.* 21, p. 409.
"	144, n. 3, l. 5,	"		usages,	" usage.
"	148, line	13,	after Mat. xv. 28, add		Hom. III. 50 (Mark xii. 24)
"	149, "	17,	*for*	*Hæres. II. c.*	*read* *Hæres. II. t.*
"	162, "	8,	"	*H. E. IV.* 49,	" *H. E. IV.* 29.
"	162, "	16,	"	*Ad Autolyc. II.*	" *Ad Autolyc. II.* 13.
"	173, "	19,	"	ἕκαστον,	" ἕκαστος.
"	173, "	20,	add commas after		"καιροὺς" and "μου"
"	174, "	7,	*for*	77 B,	*read* 77 D.

Page 184,	line 5 from bottom, *for* third,	*read*	fourth.
" 187,	" 16, *for* *Hæres. LI.*	"	*Hæres. LIII.*
" 197,	last line, *for* ἐγκεχείριστο,	"	ἐνεκεχείριστο.
" 198,	line 25, *for* LETTER FROM,	"	LETTER OF.
" 199,	" 17, " ἔπεμψέν με,	"	ἔπεμψέ με.
" 205,	" 29, " κᾷν,	"	κἂν.
" 267,	" 4, 5,		delete both lines.
" 268,	head-line, *for* SECOND TIMOTHY,	*read*	TITUS.
" 338,	under Papias, the extract on p. 339 ought to be the first on p. 338.		
" 338,	line 16 from bottom, *for* come,	*read*	came.
" 400,	" 1, *for* p. 390,	"	p. 394.
" 408,	" 17 from bottom, *for* p. 391,	"	p. 394.
" 408,	" 14 " " p. 394,	"	p. 397.
" 442,	" 3, after "ζώντων," insert		Mark xii. 27.
" 445,	head-line and line 1, *for* TESTAMENT,	*read*	TESTAMENTS.
" 452,	line 7, *for* p. 67,	"	p. 57.
" 456,	" 8, " Hebrew's,	"	Hebrews.
" 470,	" 12, " Acts xi. 2-4,	"	Clem. Rom. Ep. 2. c. 11. 2-4.

Note.—After the first eight sheets (128 pp.) of the text were printed off, it was resolved to give the references more minutely. After that Clem. Alex. has the references as in Dindorf, with Potter's pages; and Epiphanius is given with minute references to facilitate verification.

INDEX.

Abdias, Apostolical History by, cvii
Abgar of Edessa, 1
Abraxas, li
Acts (Apocryphal) of Andrew and Matthias, of Barnabas, of Bartholomew, of John, of Matthew, of Paul and Thecla, of Peter and Paul, of Philip, of Philip in Hellas, of Thaddeus, of Thomas, cvi
Acts of the Apostles, 196-206
Acts of Pilate, ci, 173, 464
Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria (Soc. H. E. I. 6), 329
Alexandrian Church, 13 n.
Alford's Comm., 272 n.
Alogi, cxi, 436-438
Anastasius Sinaita on Canon, 28 and n.
Andreas Cæsar. on Gospels, 59; on Apocal., 338
Andrew, Acts of, cvi; Gospel of, ciii
Andrew and Matthias, Acts of, cvi
Anger's Synop., 393 n., 404 *et seq.*
Anglican Articles on Canon, 40
Apelles, Gospel of, ciii
Antoninus Pius, Ep. of, 367
Apocalypse, 336-358; note on, 357
Apocalypses, Apocryphal, cvii
Apocryphal Literature, xcvi (*see* Table of Contents)
Apollinaris on Paschal controversy, xciii, 194; on Papias, 58
Apollonius on Apocal., 340
Apost. Constit. on Canon, 25 and n., 205
Apost. Fathers and Synoptists, 102-113
Apostolicon, Marcion's, 409
Archelai Disput., 390 and n.
Arethas, Œcumen., on Apocal., 338
Athanasius—
  Ad Serap., Ep. 1. 299, 310, 325
  Biogr. note, 131
  Canon of, Festal Epistle, 13 and n., 284, 353
  Cont. Apollin., 310
  Cont. Arian—Or. 1. 317, 353; Or. 2. 353; Or. 3. 299; Or. 4. 325
  De Decret. Nicen. Syn., 284
  De S. Trin., 317
  Opp., tom. ii. 13. 299, 311, 317, 330
  Synopsis ascribed to, 15 and n., 299, 311, 317, 353
Athenagoras, Legatio—
  1. 11. 131
  10. 181, 219
  12. 132, 181, 228
  13. 202, 219
  16. 202, 235, 259
  32. 132
  33. 146, 162
  34. 219
  36. 342
  37. 259
Aubé, 365 n.
Augustine, biogr. note, 22; Canon, 22; De Consen. Evang., 142 n.

Barcabbas, xlvii n.
Baring-Gould's 'Lost and Hostile Gospels,' 456 n.
Barnabas, Epistle of, i (*see* Table of Contents)
  2. 6. 168
  4. 3, 14. 102
  4. 9. 222
  4. 12. 215
  4. 13. 251 n.
  5. 1. 168
  5. 6. 272
  5. 7, 13. 168
  5. 9, 12. 102, 103, 168
  6. 6, 7, 9. 169
  6. 15. 237
  7. 2, 9. 169
  7. 2. 196, 262
  7. 11. 103
  8. 5. 169
  9. 7. 169
  11. 10. 169
  12. 5. 169
  12. 7. 248
  12. 11. 103
  13. 7. 215
  14. 1. 154
  15. 5. 253
  15. 8. 103
  15. 9. 142
  15. 10. 319
  16. 8. 170
  19. 1, 12. 170
  19. 8. 233

Barnabas, Epistle of—*continued.*
19. 11. 104
21. 2, 6. 170
21. 6. 251 n.
Barnabas, Gospel of, Apocr., cii
Bartholomew, Gospel of, cii; Acts of, cvi
Basilides, xlvii (*see* Table of Contents), 173, 389 and n.
Baur—
Evangelien, lxx, cx, 221 n., 253 n., 258 n., 365 n.
Gnosis, lxiv, 159 n.
Bercea, Gospel in, lxxi *et seq.*
Bleek, 221 n., 272 n., 280 n., 282 n., 285 n., 419 n.
Books rejected by Cath. Ap. Rom. Ch., 24
Bretschneider, cx
Brückner, 301 n., 312 n.
Bruns. Can. Apost., 20
Bryennios, ii, viii, ix n., xviii n.; xxi n.
Bunsen's 'Analect. Antenic.,' 25 n., 26 n., 95
Hippolytus, xlviii
Burgon's Photograph, 150 n., 152 n.

Caius, lxxx, 210, 279, 343, 436 n.
Canon Pasch., 345
Canon, Testimonies to, 18-41
Canones Eccles. qui dicuntur Apostolorum, 26
Carpocrates, 411 *et seq.* and n.
Carthage, Third Council of, Canon of, 20
Caspari, cxv n.
Cassiodorus Inst. Div., 352
Cataphrygians, *see* Montanists
Catholic Epp., 289-291
Cave, Hist. Lit., 427 n.
Celsus, lxxxiv, 369-378; biogr. note, 369
Cerinthus, 384
Christlieb on Tübingen School, xcv n.
Chrysostom on Canon, 23; Hom. vi, 379
Clement of Alex., lxxxi (*see* Table of Contents)
Adumbr. in Pet., 147, 202, 277
Do. 2 Jno., 328
Do. Jude, 332
Pædag. I. 5. 240
6. 229, 246, 307
8. 220
II. 12. 343
III. 11. 322
44. 332
V. 19. 252
Strom. I. x, 134, 250, 252, 263, 267
II. 259, 263, 278, 322, 416, 452, 463, 470
III. 75, 129, 146, 147, 162, 226, 227, 235, 260, 263, 296, 332, 390 and n., 431, 468, 469, 470, 471
IV. x, 232, 240, 246, 289, 296, 307, 391, 419, 420
V. 202, 254, 452
VI. 250, 277, 296, 342, 468
VII. 50, 51, 417, 464
Clementine Homs., lxiii (*see* Table of Contents)
Clem. Hom. II. 148, 438, 439
III. 134, 148, 163, 184, 203, 439-444
VIII. 135, 163, 443
IX. 163, 443
XI. 164, 184, 443
XII. and XVI. 443
XVII. 164, 443
XVIII. 135, 444
XIX. 135, 148, 164, 184, 236, 241, 444
Clem. Recog., lxiv, 204
Clement of Rome, viii (*see* Table of Contents)
Ep. I. 2. 1. 196
5. 5. 209, 230
7. 3. 255
9. 2. 273
10. 1. 273, 292
12. 1. 292
13. 2. 104, 155
15. 1. 105, 142
16. 1. 171 n., 243
17. 1, 5. 273; 2. 292; 7. 336
18. 1. 196
19. 1. 273
20. 4. 222
21. 9. 273
23. 1. 292
24. 1, 5. 222
29. 1. 256
30. 1. 293, 302
31. 2. 170, 293
32. 1. 215
34. 8. 222
35. 5. 215
36. 2. 273
37. 4. 222
38. 1, 4. 251; 2. 215, 293, 302
43. 6. 170
45. 2. 273
46. 8. 105, 155; 5. 238; 7. 215
49. 1, 6. 171, 223, 233; 5. 302
59. 2. 302; 3. 155
61. 1. 302
Ep. II. xviii. (*see* Table of Contents)
II. 1. 196; 8. 216
1. 233; 2. 65 n.; 4. 106; 7. 155, 266
3. 1. 171; 2. 106
4. 2. 106; 5. 107
5. 2-4. 107
6. 1. 106, 155; 6. 274; 9. 171
8. 5. 107, 155
9. 3. 223; 5. 171; 7. 233; 11. 106
11. 6. 274; 7. 223
12. 1. 256; 2. 108, 468
13. 4. 206
14. 2. 238; 5. 223
15. 1. 256
16. 3. 313; 4. 303
17. 3. 233; 5. 107; 7. 336
18. 2. 243
19. 1. 256; 2. 238
20. 6. 256
Epistles ascribed to Clem. Rom., xxiii

Cod. Alex., Canon of, viii, ix, 23
Cod. Claromont, Canon of, 27 and n.
Cod. D., 471
Cod. Sin., Canon of, ii, xxv, 12
Cod. Vat., Canon of, 12
Colossians, Ep. to, 247-250
Conf. Basil. Posterior on Canon, 37
Conf. Bohœm. on Canon, 39
Conf. Fid. Gallic. or La Rochelle, 38 and n.
Conf. Helvet. Prior, 37
Conf. Helvet. Posterior, 38
Conf., Old Scottish, 39
Conf. Westminst., 40
Conf. Wirtemberg, 40 n.
Consummation of Thomas, cvi
Corinthians, 1 Ep. to, 222-229
" 2 Ep. to, 230-232
Cotterill's 'Peregrinus Proteus,' 65 n., 218 n., 368 n.
Councils—Laod., 18; Carth., 20; Trullan, 27 n., 29; Trent, 20 n., 30; Jerus., 33 n., 34
Cramer's Catena, 241, 338
Credner, 18 n.; Gesch., lxxx, lxxxiv, 24 n., 27 n., 28 n., 30 n., 307 n., 466 n.; Beiträge, lxiv n., lxvii
Curetonian Syriac, 2 n.
Cureton, Ignatius, xxvii
Cyprian—
Adv. Jud., 1. 20. 282
De bono patient., 309, 325, 350
De eleemos., 350
De exhort. mart., 11. 282
De Hær. Baptiz., 329
Ep. 28 (al. 25) 324
Ep. 58 (al. 56) 309
Ep. 63, 350
Ep. 69 (al. 76) 324
Cyril of Jer., lxx; Canon of, 19, 299, 353; Catech., 139
Cyril Lukar on Canon, 33 and n.

Damasus, 24
Davidson's 'Introduction to N. T.,' xciii, cix, 156 n., 221 n., 239 n., 253 n., 303 n.
Descent of Christ to the under world, ci
Dillmann, 333 n.
Dindorf, 427 n.
Diognetus, Ep. to—
3. 198
4. 234
5. 226, 230, 245
7. 179
9. 127, 217, 306
10. 179, 321
11. 65 and n., 179, 257
12. 226
Dionysius of Alex., Ep. ad Basil, 86, 185, 345 (Eus. H. E. VI. 41)
Dionysius of Corinth, 44 and n. (Eus. H. E. IV. 23)
Docetæ, 425 *et seq.*
Donaldson's Apostolical Fathers, iii, vii n., xvi n., xxiv, xxv, xxxiv, lxxx
" 'Christian Literat.,' 65 n., 66 n., 179 n., 194 n.
Donaldson in 'Theol. Rev.,' viii n.
Dosithei Conf., 34
Dressel on Ignatius, xxix, xxxvii; Clementines, lxiv
Drummond on John and Justin, cix n., 178
Duæ viæ, vel Judicium Petri, 1 n.

Easter, date of, 13 n.
Ebedjesu catal. libr. Syr., 345
Ebionites, lxix, 431 *et seq.*; Gospel of, lxxiv
Eichhorn, 394 n.
Ellicott (Cambridge Essays), lxxvii n.
Encratites, Gospel of, ciii
Enoch, Book of, vii n.
Ephesians, Epistle to, 237-242
Epiphanius, biogr. note, 95; Canon of, 21 and n., 165, 285, 299, 353; on Quartodecim., 195
Hær. I. 2. 2. 335
24. 391
26. 284
28. 384
29. 455
30. 139, 412, 434, 456 *et seq.*, 459, 461, 463
31. 299
33. 423 *et seq.*
34. 330
36. 420
42. 241, 285, 397, 400, 408
44. 430
46. 456
48. 435
50. 465
51. 95-98, 139, 149, 165, 186, 187, 290, 354, 355, 436 *et seq.*
54. 429
62. 409
66. 318
69. 186, 285
70. 285
76. 311, 318
77. 299, 355
Sch. 4, 7, 15. 410
19. 402
29, 44. 403
34, 35, 40. 404
47, 48, 52, 53. 405
58-61. 406
63, 64, 72. 407
Epistles, in general, 207 (Eus. H. E. III. 3)
Esdras, vii n.
Essenes, lxxvi
Eusebius—
Ad Marinum, 151
Canon of, 10, 164, 185, 206, 453 (H. E. III. 25)
Canon, as whole, views of, 10 n.
Chron. ad A. 2 et 3 Claud., xxviii n., xli, 148
Chron. ad A. 14 Domit. 186
Chron. ad Olymp., 53
De Eccles. Theol. III., 299
De Martyr Pal., 283
Dem. Evang., III. 5. 90 *et seq.*; 149, 298; 8. 352; V. 3. 283, 329

Eusebius—*continued.*
Onomasticon, lxx
Præp. Evang., 283
Theophan., IV. 12. 453, 459, 461
Hist. Eccl. I. 7. 137, 163 (Jul. Afric.)
12. 298
13. 1
II. 1. 298
2. 465
16. 149
17. 205, 283
22. 211, 264
23. 127, 199, 290, 298
25. 212
III. 3. 207, 211, 283, 290, 298, 310, 317
4. 164, 206, 265, 310
18. 353
20. 127
23. 184, 186
24. 87 *et seq.*, 185, 352
25. 8 n., 298, 310
27. 432, 453
28. 343
29. 353
32. 258
34. x n.
36. 53, 111 n.
37. 65, 283
39. Clem. Rom., x; Papias, 11 n., 141, 167, 197, 305, 321, 352, 461
40. 54 *et seq.*, 451
IV. 3. 67 n., 71 n.
7. 389, 391
9. 365
11. 394
14. 305
18. 339
22. 2 n., 128, 451
23. Dion. of Corinth, ix, 44, 197
24. 342
26. Melito, 43
29. Tatian, 210
49. 162
V. 1. 158, 180, 218, 257, 306, 321, 340
2. 198, 306, 340
3. 245, 257
4. 159 n.
6. x
8. 67 n., 71 n., 322
10. Pantænus, 133
13. 397
18. Apollonius, 340
20. 46
22. 23. Pasch. Controv., 189-192
26. 276
31. 183
VI. 13. 277
14. 74 *et seq.*, 184, 277, 289, 290, 296, 307, 322
17. 433
19. 378

Eusebius—*continued.*
Hist. Eccl. VI. 20. 210, 279
25. 8 *et seq.*, 87 n., 159 n., 163, 205, 290
41. 282
VII. 10. 345
24. 346
25. 185, 290, 324, 346, 436

Fabricius, Cod. Apoc., lxix n., xcviii n., xcix n., 456 n.
Firmilian, Ep. ad Cypr., 317
Fleischer, 148 n.
Formula Concord. on Canon, 36
Fourth Gospel, cviii (*see* Table of Contents)
Froude, J. A., lxxxiv n.

Galatians, Ep. to, 233-236.
Gebhardt and Harnack, 'Pat. Apost.,' vi n., ix n., x n., xi n., xxv
Gelasius on Canon, 23 and n.
Gieseler, 'Ch. Hist.,' 434 n.
Glaucias, xlix, xcix
Gloag, Rev. Dr, 209 n., 237 n., 255 n.
Godet, cxi n., cxii n.
Gospel, Apocryphal, of Andrew, Barnabas, Bartholomew, Judas Iscariot, Judas Thaddæus, Matthias, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Twelve Apostles, cii and notes
" of Eve, of Perfection, of Seth, of Truth, ciii and notes
" of the Ebionites, lxxiv
" of the Egyptians, xxii, lxxvi, 468 *et seq.*
" of James, c, 464 *et seq.*
" of the Hebrews, lxviii (*see* Table of Contents), xliv, 451-463; Ebionite form, 456 *et seq.*
" of Nicodemus, ci
" of Peter, 466 *et seq.*
Gospels, 53-101
" extra-canonical, 451-469
Greg. Nazian., carm. 33. 318
Greg, W. R., 'Enigmas of Life,' xcviii

Hadrian to Min. Fid., 364; to Servianus, 366
Harmonies, ciii
Harnack, Zeit des Ignatius, xxviii
Heathen, testimonies of, 361-379
Hebrews, Ep. to, 272-288
Hefele, iv n., viii n., lxxxiv, 27 n, 95 n.
Hegesippus, lxxvii (*see* Table of Contents), xi, 2 n., 127 *et seq.*, 227; Phot. Cod., 128
Heracleon, 419-422
Heretics, testimonies of, 383-446; tabular lists of, 447
Hermas, xxiv (*see* Table of Contents)
Mand. I. 1. 109, 143
II. 2. 294, 303
IV. 1. 1. 109
V. 2. 7. 155
IX. 1. 294
8. 109

Hermas—*continued.*
Mand. X. 2. 5. 238
3. 2. 337
XI. 5. and 9. 294
XII. 1. 1. 295
3. 5. 174
5. 2. 295
6. 3. 109, 295
Sim. V. 5. 2. 175
6. 1. 110
6. 2, 3. 175
7. 2. 224
VIII. 3. 110.
IX. 12. 1. 175
13. 5. 239
16. 5. 303
20. 2. 110
21. 3. 303 (cf. ix, 14. 6)
25. 143[1]
29. 3. 110
Vis. I. 3. 2. 336
4. 1. 337
II. 2. 4. 196
2. 7. 337
2. 8. 108
4. 1. 337
III. 5. 1. 337
6. 5. 108
7. 1. 313
9. 5, 7. 109, 275, 293
11. 3. 303
IV. 1. 10. 337
2. 1. 337
2. 4. 303, 337
2. 6. 109
3. 4. 303, 313
Hermas and Apocalypse, 336 n.
Hesse, lxxx, lxxxi
Hilary (Ps. c and de Trin.), 355
Hilgenfeld, i n., ii, iv n., ix n., 159 n., 221 n., 237 n., 301 n., 365 n., 393 n., 402, 403, 404, 406, 408, 456 n., 459 n.
Barnabas, ii, ix n.
Clem. Rom., xix, xx
Einleitung, lxxx
Kritische Untersuchungen, lxiv, lxvi, lxvii
N. T. extra-Can. Rec., i n., iv n., lxviii, cvii
Pat. Apost. Proleg., xxv
Hippolytus on Apocalypse, 345
Cont. Hær. Noeti, 147
Ref. Omn. Hær.—
V. 7. 385 *et seq.*
11. 19, 23, 26. 389
12. 16, 17, 21. 388
VI. 9. 383
10. 14, 16, 19. 384
29. 34, 35. 417
VII. 19. 1
20. 389
22. 173, 391
25. 392
26. li, 391, 392
27. 173, 390, 393
29. 420
31. 397, 425
Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hær.—*continued.*
VII. 34. 432
35. 419
42. 425
VIII. 9. 425
10. 419, 426
18. 192
19. 434
IX. 12. 419
X. 4. 397
19. 397
20. 429
εἰς τὰ ἅγια Θεοφ., 147
περὶ ἀναστάσ., 279
περὶ τῆς συντελ. τ. κόσ., 280, 296
περὶ χαρισμ., 147
Holtzmann, 159 n.
Hormisdas, 24
Hort, lii, 420 n., 424 n.

Ignatius, xxvi (*see* Table of Contents)
Eph. 2. 8, 16. 224
5. 110
10. 256
11. 111, 320
12. 239
14. 19. 111
15. 338
17. 111, 171
18. 111, 171, 216
20. 216
Magn. 5. 196
7. 239
8. 172
9. 111
10. 224
Mart. Ig. 2. 112
Philad. 2. 172, 196, 239, 251
5. 42
7. 172, 224
8. 42, 243
9. 43, 172
11. 216
Polyc. 1. 251
2. 112
5. 239
Rom. 5. and 9. 224
7. 172
Smyrn. 1. 111, 216
3. 111, 451, 462
5. 7. 43
6. 112
9. 10. 262
11. 225, 243
Trall. 8. 172
11. 111
Classification of quotations, xxx
Irenæus and Hippolytus on Basilides, liii
Irenæus, I. 1. 257, 259
3. 1, 4, 5. 416
3. 2. 414
3. 5. 415
3. 6. 45, 414
6. 3. 45
8. 1. 414
8. 8. 415

Irenæus—*continued.*
I. 11. 1. 413
14. 3. 408
15. 1. 432
16. 1. 424
16. 3. 266, 328
25. 1, 2, 4. 411, 459
25. 6. 412
26. 2. 431, 452
27. 2. 394, 408
I. Præf., 2. 413, 422
II. 4. 1. 419
14. 7. 257, 259
22. 4. 249
22. 5. 71, 182
30. 9. 276
35. 4. 45
III. 1. 66, 145, 159, 182
3. 3. x, 263
3. 4. xxxiv, 182, 266
4. 1, 2. 46
6. 5. 235
7. 1. 231, 252
7. 2. 235
9. 1. 129
9. 2. 130
10. 1. 162
10. 6. 145
11. 1. 183
11. 7. 67, 145, 182, 395, 414, 432, 452
11. 8. 68, 69, 435, 436
11. 9. 229, 414
11. 12. 414
12. 12. 397, 408
14. 1. 67, 200, 249, 263, 397
15. 1. 432
16. 2. 130
16. 3, 9. 219, 235
16. 5. 322
16. 8. 322, 328
23. 8. 228
33. ix
IV. 8. 4. 245
9. 2. 307
11. 4. 276
13. 4. 225
16. 2. 295
16. 5. 307
20. 11. 340
27. 1. 218, 226
28. 3. 231
32. 1. 71
36. 4. 315
V. 1. 1. 295
2. 3. 240
5. 1. 231, 276
6. 1. 252
14. 2. 249
14. 3. 240
15. 3. 266
21. 1. 235
23. 2. 315
25. 1. 254
26. 1. 341
30. 2. 252

Irenæus—*continued.*
V. 30. 3. 341
33. 3. 53, 245
36. 1, 2. 72, 167, 183
Ep. ad Florin, xxxiv, 46 (Eus. H. E. V. 20)

Jacobi, xviii n.
James, Gospel of, or Protevangel, c; Ep. of, 292-300
Jerome on Gospel of Hebrews, lxx *et seq.*; Canon of, 21; Ep. II. ad Paulin, 165, 187, 287, 291, 308, 311, 326, 355
Adv. Jovin., I. 26. 188, 256
II. 3. 435
Biogr. note, 99
Com. in Is., 140, 165, 171, 287, 356, 454, 455, 458, 462, 463
" Ezech., 455, 458
" Dan., 188
" Hos., 140
" Mic., 453
" Mat. Proem., 74, 99, 187, 430, 454, 461, 462, 469
" Mat. Prolog., 140, 287
" John, Præf. ad Damas, 101, 140
" Ep. to Gal., 288
" Ep. to Eph., 242, 453, 458
" Ep. to Philem., 270
" Ep. to Titus, 260, 267, 287, 335
De Vir. Ill. (or Catal. Script. Eccles.)
1. 149, 311
2. 299, 454, 462
3. 139, 454
4. 335
5. 213, 286
7. 165, 166, 206
8. 149
9. 187, 326, 330, 339, 355
15. 274
16. 451, 462
18. 57 (Papias), 330
24. 340
25. 74
36. 133 (Pantænus)
41. 467
59. 210
61. 345
63. 138
74. 352
Dial. II. adv. Pelag., 152, 455, 460
Ep. ad Algas., 74, 246
" Damas. Ep. 20. 140, 261
145. 166
" Dardan., 287, 355
" Evag., 330
" Hedib., 140, 150, 152, 311, 458, 462
" Lucin., 71. 58
" Theodoram, 53
Epist. Canon. (Prolog. 7), 290, 311
Præf. in Codd. Antiq., 188
Jerusalem, Council of, on Canon, 34
John, Acts of (Apocr.), cvi
" Gospel of, cviii (*see* Fourth Gospel), 167-195
" in Ephesus, note on, xlv

John of Damascus, xxi
Jones on the Canon, cvi n.
Josephus, 94
Judas Iscariot, Gospel of, cii
Judas Thaddæus, Gospel of, cii
Jude, Ep. of, 331-335; note on, 331
Julius Afric., 137 (*see* Eus. H. E. I. 7)
Julius Cassianus, 431
Justin Martyr, liii (*see* Table of Contents)
Apol. I. 4. 114
5. 176
14. 114
15. 115
16. 116, 143, 156
17. 31, 61, 117, 156
19. 156, 225
20. 22, 23. 176
26. 393 *et seq.*
32. 144, 176, 321
33. 61, 157
34. 157
35. 176, 464
38. 63 n., 471
39. 49, 50. 144
45. 144
48. 464
49. 144
58. 394
60. 226, 275
61. 177
63. 118, 177, 275
66. 60, 62, 177
II. 6. 177
De Resurrect., I. 178
7. 244
9. 178, 245
Dial. 7. 258
10. 60
13. 321
14. 39, 41. 226
17. 118
20. 198
23. 27. 217
35. 125
47. 51. 126, 217, 267
48. 177
49. 62, 118, 198
62. 63. 177
68. 198
69. 126, 177
76. 119, 157
77. 120 *et seq.*, 464
78. 158
81. 158, 339
82. 122
84. 158, 248
85. 248
88. 61, 122, 126, 143, 158, 178
93. 123
95. 234
96. 158, 321
99. 123
100. 60, 63, 123, 158, 248
101. 63, 471
102. 124
103. 59, 63, 124, 158
Justin Martyr—*continued.*
Dial. 104. 61
105. 61, 64, 124, 178
106. 61, 64, 127, 143
107. 64, 124
110. 253
111. 226
113. 321
114. 178
118. 198
122. 124
123. 178
125. 125
138. 250
Exposit. Fid., 15, 178
Orat. ad Gent., 5. 234
Juvenal, Sat. viii. 235. 362 n.

Keim, Aus dem Urchr., xxxiv n., 365 n.
" Celsus, 369 n.
" Gesch. Jes., vi n.
" Jes. v. Naz., xv, xlv, cix, 170 n., 364 n., 369 n.
Kimmel, 33 n.
Kleuker, lxix n., xcviii n., 456 n.
Krenkel, xlv

Lactantius, Instit. iv., 52, 352
Lagarde, 38, 279 n., 345 n.
Laodicea, Council of, on Canon, 18
Lardner, v n., 42 n., 44 n., 95 n., 364 n., 409, 430 n., 436 n., 456 n.
Lee, Dr R., lxi n.
Letter of Christians of Vienne and Lyons, 158 and n., 180 (Eus. H. E. V. 1, 2, 3.)
Leucius (Lucius) Charinus, cvii
Lightfoot (Clement, viii, xix n., xxi, 456 n.; Ignatius, xxvii, xxix; Papias, xli; Silence of Eusebius, xliii), 168; Philip., 209; Gal., 227, 432 n.
Lipsius, xxxvi n., lxiv n., lxx, 424 n., 432 n., 436 n., 447
Lucian, De Morte Pereg., lv, 368; biogr. note, 368
Lücke, 319 n., 333 n., 338 n.
Luke, Gospel of, 154-166
Luke for Lucanus, 164 n.
Luthardt, John, liii, cxi
Lutheran testimony on Canon, 36
Lützelberger, cix

Manichees, Gospel of, ciii
Mansel's 'Gnosticism,' 384 n.
Marcion, xxxvii, 393-410; notes on, 75 and 393 *et seq.*; his Gospel examined, 400-408; Ep., 408-410; Apostolicon, 409
Marcus, 424 *et seq.*
Mark, Gospel of, 141-153; evidence on c. 16. 9-20, 150 *et seq.*
Martial, lib. x. Epig. 25, 362
Martyrdom of Polycarp, xl
Matthew, Acts of (Apocr.), cvi
Matthew, Gospel of, 114-140
Matthias, Gospel of (Apocr.), cii
Melito, xci, 2 n., 43; orat. to Anton. Cæsar, 314

Methodius, 351
Meyer on Acts, 163 n.
Migne, 'Dict. des Apocryphes,' xcviii
Mill, N. T., 2 n., 297 n.
Monoïmus, 425 n.
Montanists, 434-436
Montanus, biogr. note, 434
Muratorian Canon, xxv, xliv, lxxix (*see* Table of Contents), 3.-8. 182, 199, 211, 218, 227, 231, 234, 321

Naassenes, 385
Nazarenes, lxix, 431
New Testament, as a whole, 42-52
Nicephorus on Canon, 29, 455 n.
Nicholson's Gosp. of Hebrews, lxxvii, 453 n., 456 n., 459 n.
Nicodemus, Gospel of, ci
Nicolas, 'Evangiles Apocryphes,' cv
Niemeyer, 37 n., 38 n.
Norton, 'Genuineness of the Gospels,' xliii, lxi n., 362 n.

Œcumenius and Arethas on Apocal., 338
Oehler, 'O. T. Theol.,' 84 n.
Old Cath. Union on Canon, 32 and n.
Ophites, 385
Origen, lxxxiii (*see* Table of Contents)
Canon of, 8 (Eus. H. E. VI. 25), 185, 308
Com. in Mat., 136, 185, 264, 269, 324, 334, 344, 464
Mk., 148
Com. in John, 83 *et seq.*, 136, 163, 185, 281, 290, 297, 309, 317, 324, 344, 397, 420, 421, 452, 463
Com. in Ep. ad Rom., 163, 221, 281, 282, 290, 297, 316, 334, 391
Cont. Cels. I. 9, 32. 377
28. 371, 377
38, 58, 62. 372
40. 369
41, 63. 374
50. 375
63. 290
66. 373
67, 70. 376
II. 13, 15, 26. 370
18. 374
24, 45. 373
27. 370, 417
31, 36, 49. 376
32, 48, 59, 63. 375
74. 370
III. 81
20. 211
V. 56. 371
64. 377
VI. 11. 205
12. 377
16. 373
42. 378
VIII. 24. 378
De Orat , 136, 281, 290, 323, 471
De Princip., 2. 309
3. 241, 334
4. 460, 467

Origen—*continued.*
Dial. de recta fide, 163, 317
Ep. ad Afric., 205, 280
Hexapl. in Ps. ii., 205
Hom. on Gen. xiii., 51 *et seq.*, 163, 308
Hom. on Josh. vii, 52, 163
Levit., 316
Numb., 281, 316
Jer. xv., 453, 471; xix., 269
Hom. in Lk., 81, 163 (Eus. H. E. VI. 25), 185, 390, 469
In libr. Jes. Nave, 317
Selecta in Gen., 185
Exod., 298, 316
Selecta in Ps. iii., 290, 309; xxx. and xxxvi., 297
Sum of testimony, 9 n.
Otto's Justin, 364 n.
Overbeck, 365 n.

Pamphilus on Apocal., 352
Pantænus, 133 (Eus. H. E. V. 10 and Jer. Vir. Ill. 36), 277
Papias, xli (*see* Table of Contents), 53-59, 114, 141, 167 (Eus. H. E. III. 39), 338
Parchor, xlvii n.
Paschal controversy, lxxxv (*see* Table of Contents), 189-195; chronicle, xliii n., 59, 193-195
Passages of unknown origin, &c., 470 *et seq.*
Pastoral Epp., 255 n.
Paul, Epp. of, in general, 209-214
Paul and Thecla, Acts of, cvi, 180, 199, 236
Peratæ, 388
Peshito, 1, 2 n., 199, 210, 218, 227, 231, 234
Peter and Paul, Acts of (Apocr.), cvi
Peter, 1 Ep., 301-311; 2 Ep., 312-318
Peter, Gospel of (Apocr.), cii
Peter, Preaching of, xiv
Philaret, Cat. of Eastern Ch. on Canon, 34
Philastrius, De Hær., 399, 438
Philemon, Ep. to, 269-271
Philip, Acts of, cvi
Philip, Gospel of (Apocr.), cii
Philip in Hellas, Acts of, cvi
Philippians, Ep. to, 243-246
Photius Biblioth., 59
Pilate, Acts of (*see* Acts of Pilate)
Pius IX., Pope, decree of, ci
Pliny, Ep. to Trajan, xviii, 362
Plumptre, 164 n., 166 n.
Polycarp, xxxiii (*see* Table of Contents)
Philipp., 1. 2. 197
1. 3. 239, 304
2. 1. 244, 304
2. 2. 230, 304
3. 1. 244
3. 2. 233
3. 3. 216, 320
4. 1. 230, 257
5. 1. 234
5. 2. 262
5. 3. 225, 305
6. 1. 216, 230
6. 2. 216
6. 3. 234

Polycarp—*continued.*
Philipp., 7. 1. 320, 328
7. 2. 305
8. 1. 305, 321
9. 2. 234, 244, 263
10. 1, 2. 305
11. 2. 225
11. 3. 244, 253
11. 4. 253
12. 1. 239, 275
12. 2. 234
12. 3. 257
Classification of Polycarp's quotations, xxxix
Polycarp, Martyrdom of—
1. 244
2. 225
7. 113, 197
10. 217
14. 113, 173
20. 217
Classification of quotations in, xl
Polycrates, 183 (Eus. H. E. V. 31)
Porphyry, 378
Possini, Catena Pat., 129 n.
Prepon, 425
Presbyters, testimony of, cviii n., 71 *et seq.*, 218; 1 Cor., 226 (Iræn. adv. H. IV. 27)
Protevan. Jac. (*see* Gospel of James)
'Princeton Review,' viii. n.
Pseudo-Origen, 396
Pseudo-Tertullian, 434 n.
Ptolemæus, 422-424; Let. to Flora, 423 *et seq.*

QUADRATUS on Gospels, 66
" Proconsul, xxxv
Quartodecimans, xciii n., xciv, &c.

REFORMED Conf. on Can., 37 *et seq.*
Rénan, 'L'Église Chrétienne,' li, 365 n., 384 n.
Responsiones ascribed to Polycarp, 53 n.
Reuss, Gesch. xxv, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, 32 n., 40 n., 104 n., 142 n., 221 n., 237 n., 247 n.
Ritschl, 404 *et seq.*
Roberts's 'Discussions,' lxx, lxxi, 456 n.
" 'Bible of our Lord,' cxv
Rœnsch, 393 n.
Romans, Ep. to, 215-221
Routh's 'Rel. Sac.,' cviii n., 86, 167, 390
Ruinart, xxvii n.

SANDAY on Mark, xliv; on John, cix, cxi, 390 n., 393 n., 401, 407, 418 n.
Saturnilus, 425 n.
Schaff, 30 n., 32 n., 34 n., 36 n., 38 n.
Schisms and heresies, predictions of, xv, 125
Schleiermacher, 154 n., 257 n.
Scrivener, 1 n., 137 n.
Scythianus, ciii n.
Semler, xcvi, 394 n.
Seneca, Ep. 14. 362 n.
Servianus, 366 n.
Sibylline Oracles, iv n., xx, lxxxii
Simon Magus, 383
Simonians, Gospel of, ciii
Sinker, 445 n.
Sirach, vii n.
Smith of Jordanhill, 154 n.
Smith's 'Dict. of Christian Biog.,' 420 n.
Speaker's Commentary, 142 n., 393 n.
Stanley on Corr., 209 n.
Stieren's 'Irenæus,' 129 n., 389 n.
Strauss, cx
Stroth, lv
Suetonius, Claud. and Nero, 364
'Supernatural Religion,' xlix n., li, lxxvii, lxxviii, 44 n., 154 n., 392 n., 393 n., 401, 403, 414 n., 422 n., 456 n.
Symmachus, 432
Syriac Version (*see* Peshito)

TACITUS, Ann., xv, 44, 361
Tatian, 72 (Eus. H. E. IV. 29); 129 (Clem. Alex. Strom. III.); 162 (Eus. H. E. IV. 40); (Orat. c. Græc.), 162, 180, 202 227, 229, 249
Tertullian, biogr. note, 46
Adv. Marc. I. 1, 19. 395
II. 29. 395
III. 14. 343
IV. 1. 49, 410
2. 75, 162, 184, 396
3. 77
4. 78, 397, 408
5. 79, 148, 163, 184, 343
6. 395, 397
19. 402
26, 27, 28. 403
35. 405
39. 406
43. 407 *et seq.*
V. 1. 408
2. 203, 236
3. 409
9. 134
11, 17. 241
14. 221 n.
15. 410
21. 260, 268 *et seq.*
Adv. Prax. 13. 221
15. 50, 323
23. 184
25. 323
27. 308
Adv. Valent. 4. 423
Apologet. 21. 465
31. 50
De Bapt. 10. 203
17. 199 n.
De Car. Christi 1. 395
2. 396
7. 402
20, 22. 134
De Corona 6. 220
De Cult. Fem. 333
De Jejun. 1. 435
10. 203
De Monog. 11. 50
De Orat. 8. 296
20. 308

Tertullian—*continued.*
De Pudicit. 13. 232, 260
20. 278
De Præscr. Hær. x
6. 236, 268
7. 250
22. 203
25. 260, 264
30. 46, 417
32. 46
33. 46, 343
34. 47, 229
36, 37. 47
38. 48 *et seq.*, 184, 395, 417
De Res. Carn. 23. 246, 250
24. 252, 254
47. 246
De Virg. Vel. 17. 307
Scorp. 12. 246, 308, 323
13. 220, 254, 264
14. 308
Test. of Twelve Patriarchs, lxix, 445 *et seq.*
Testimonies, oldest, to a collection, 1-17.
Thaddæus, Acts of (Apocr.), cvi
Theodas (Theododes), xcix
Theodoret (Tatian), Hær. Fab. I. 20, 73
I. 24. 399
II. (Eus. H. E. IV. 29), 455, 468
Arg. in Ep. to Heb., 284 *et seq.*
Theodoti Epitom. 6. 426
9, 10. 427
12, 14, 19, 22, 44, 49, 85, 86. 428
Theodotus, 426-429, 426 n.
Theophilus of Antioch, 73 and n.
Ad Autolyc. I. 2. 229, 231
7. 231, 240
13. 229
14. 220
II. 2. 246
9, 13. 315
16. 240, 267
17. 245
22. 162, 182, 249
28. 240, 342
III. 4. 231
9. 267
13. 14. 132, 220, 259
Thessalonians, 1 Ep. to, 251, 252
" 2 Ep. to, 253, 254
Thilo's Cod. Apoc., 393 n.
Thomas, Acts of (Apocr.), ci, cvi
" Gospel of (Apocr.), cvi
Timothy, 1 Ep. to, 255-261
" 2 Ep. to, 262-265
Titus, Ep. to, 266-268
Tischendorf, 2 n., 12 n., 28 n., 403; Evang. Apoc., xcix n., 156 n., 174 n.; Nov. Test., 221 n.
De Evan. Apocr. Orig., xcvi, cv
Tract. Schab., xvi, 470
Trajan, xxv n., 364
Tregelles, Can. Mur., lxxx n.
Trent, Council of, on Canon, 30 *et seq.*
Trullan Council on Canon, 29
Tübingen School, xvii
Twelve Apostles, Gospel of, ciii
Twelve Patriarchs, Testaments of, 445

Uhlhorn, Die Homilien, lxii n., lxiv n., lxvi n., lxvii
Ur-Evangelium, lv
Usher, xxvii

Valentinian quotation, examples of, 415 *et seq.*
Valentinus, 413 *et seq.* and n.
Version, Old Latin, 2, 199, 210, 218, 227, 231, 234
Victorinus Petav. on Apocal., 351
Volkmar, lxiv n., lxxx, 307 n., 393 n., 404, 407, 408, 436 n.
Voss, xxvii

Waddington on Polycarp, xxxv
Weiss, 313 n.
Weizsäcker, cxiii
Westcott, 28 n., 30 n., 218 n., 280 n., 323 n., 333 n., 418 n., 419 n.
Wieseler's 'Christenverfolgungen,' xxviii, xxxiv, xxxvi, 113 n., 258 n., 365 n.
" Synopsis, lxxxvi
Wittichen, cix n., cx, cxi, cxii
Wordsworth on Polycarp, xxxiv

York, Archbishop of, 393 n.

Zahn's 'Ignatius,' xxvii n., xxix, xxxvi, 368 n.
" 'Pat. Apost.,' xxvii, xxxiv
Zeller, 154 n.

MESSRS WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS' *NEW LIST.*

PHILOSOPHICAL CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Edited by WILLIAM KNIGHT, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of St Andrews. In crown 8vo Volumes, with Portraits.

VOL. I. DESCARTES. By Professor MAHAFFY, Dublin. [*In a few days.*

The following are in preparation :—

BERKELEY. By Prof. Fraser, Edinburgh.
BUTLER. By Rev. Canon W. L. Collins.
FICHTE. By Professor Adamson, Owen's College, Manchester.
HUME. By the Editor.
HAMILTON. By Prof. Veitch, Glasgow.
HEGEL. By Prof. Edward Caird, Glasgow.
HOBBES. By Professor Croom Robertson, London.
KANT. By William Wallace, Merton College, Oxford.
SPINOZA. By Dr Martineau, Principal of Manchester New College.
VICO. By Professor Flint, Edinburgh.

The Series will include BACON, LOCKE, LEIBNITZ, COMTE, &c.

The success which attended the experiment of introducing the Greek and Roman Classics to English Readers, induced the Publishers to undertake a similar series, devoted to Foreign European Classics. In now announcing the extension of their Scheme to another Series, dealing with the chief Philosophical writers of modern Europe, from Descartes and Bacon onwards, the Publishers feel assured that they are filling up a blank in literature.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED, THE THIRD EDITION OF

THEISM. By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.,

Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh ; Author of 'The Philosophy of History in Europe,' &c. Third Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED, SECOND EDITION.

ANTI-THEISTIC THEORIES. By the same AUTHOR.

New Edition, revised. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY IN EUROPE.

By the same AUTHOR. Vol. I., containing the History of that Philosophy in France and Germany. 8vo, 15s. Vol. II. *in preparation.*

THE INSTITUTES OF LAW: A Treatise of the Principles of JURISPRUDENCE AS DETERMINED BY NATURE.

By JAMES LORIMER, Regius Professor of Public Law and of the Law of Nature and Nations in the University of Edinburgh. New Edition, revised throughout, and much enlarged. 8vo, 18s.

STUDIES IN ROMAN LAW. With Comparative Views of the LAWS OF FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND SCOTLAND.

By LORD MACKENZIE, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. Fifth Edition, Revised. Edited by JOHN KIRKPATRICK, Esq., M.A. Cantab., Dr Jur. Heidelb., LL.B. Edin. 8vo, 12s.

WORKS BY PROFESSOR CRAWFORD.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED, THE THIRD EDITION.

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE RESPECTING THE ATONEMENT. By the late THOMAS J. CRAWFORD, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo, 12s.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD, CONSIDERED IN ITS GENERAL AND SPECIAL ASPECTS, AND PARTICULARLY IN RELATION TO THE ATONEMENT, WITH A REVIEW OF RECENT SPECULATIONS ON THE SUBJECT. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 8vo, 9s.

THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS, AND OTHER SERMONS. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

MYSTERIES OF CHRISTIANITY; BEING THE BAIRD LECTURE FOR 1874. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

THE LAND OF GILEAD. By LAURENCE OLIPHANT, Author of 'Piccadilly,' &c. In One Vol. 8vo, with Illustrations. [*In November.*

AN OLD EDUCATIONAL REFORMER—DR BELL. By J. M. D. MEIKLEJOHN, M.A., Professor of the Theory, History, and Practice of Education in the University of St Andrews. In crown 8vo.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

A MANUAL OF ENGLISH PROSE LITERATURE, BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL: DESIGNED MAINLY TO SHOW CHARACTERISTICS OF STYLE. By W. MINTO, Professor of Logic in the University of Aberdeen. In crown 8vo. [*Immediately.*

A HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE. By JOHN HILL BURTON, D.C.L., Historiographer-Royal for Scotland; Author of a 'History of Scotland,' &c. In 3 vols. 8vo, 36s.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED.

THE INVASION OF THE CRIMEA: ITS ORIGIN, AND AN ACCOUNT OF ITS PROGRESS DOWN TO THE DEATH OF LORD RAGLAN. By A. W. KINGLAKE. Vol. VI. "THE WINTER TROUBLES." Demy 8vo, with a Map, 16s.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER. BOOKS I.-XII. Translated into English Verse, with Notes and Parallel Passages. By SIR CHARLES DU CANE, K.C.M.G. Large 8vo, 10s. 6d.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

BS2320
.C5
AUTHOR Charteris, A. H.
TITLE Canonicity.
DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME

BS
2320
C5

D IN U. S. A.